



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

**The Arthur and Elizabeth
SCHLESINGER LIBRARY
on the History of Women
in America**

RADCLIFFE COLLEGE



COMMITTEE ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE

HEARING

BEFORE

THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A COMMITTEE
ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE

DECEMBER 3, 4, AND 5, 1913



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

1914

U57-206
1914

COMMITTEE ON RULES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

ROBERT L. HENRY, Texas, *Chairman*.

EDWARD W. POULSON, North Carolina.
THOMAS W. HARDWICK, Georgia.
FINIS J. GARRETT, Tennessee.
MARTIN D. FOSTER, Illinois.
JAMES C. CANTRILL, Kentucky.

HENRY M. GOLDFOGLE, New York.
PHILIP P. CAMPBELL, Kansas.
IRVING L. LENROOT, Wisconsin.
EDWIN A. MERRITT, Jr., New York.
M. CLYDE KELLY, Pennsylvania.

W. E. CLARK, *Clerk*.

COMMITTEE ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Washington, December 3, 1913.

The committee met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. Robert L. Henry (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Campbell, Garrett, Lenroot, Hardwick, Kelly, and Pou.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The Committee on Rules has assembled to-day for the purpose of having a hearing pertaining to a series of resolutions on the subject of woman's suffrage. Dr. Shaw will take charge of the proceedings on the part of the proponents of the resolutions.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with the hearing I wish to introduce the following resolution, which I will ask the clerk to read:

The clerk (reading):

Whereas the question of equal suffrage is one of vital public interest and the people of the Nation have an inherent right to full knowledge of the action upon it by their representatives in Congress and the committees of Congress; therefore, be it

Resolved, That all hearings upon this subject before the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives be open to the public and that all executive sessions of the committee be dispensed with in order that discussion in the committee and the final vote shall be a matter of public record.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the resolution is simply to give what seems to be an inherent right, and that is the right of the people to realize the attitude of their representatives. I introduced this resolution with the hope that the committee will pass it, so that all executive sessions will be dispensed with and the final vote will be a matter of public record. I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee on Rules, has offered a resolution and the Chair will take the liberty of reading it again (reading):

Whereas the question of equal suffrage is one of vital public interest, and the people of the Nation have an inherent right to full knowledge of the action upon it by their representatives in Congress and the committees of Congress; therefore, be it

Resolved, That all hearings upon this subject before the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives be open to the public, and that all executive sessions of the committee be dispensed with in order that the discussion in the committee and the final vote shall be a matter of public record.

To this resolution Mr. Lenroot of Wisconsin offers the amendment to strike out the words "and that the executive sessions of the com-

mittee be dispensed with in order that discussion in the committee," so that the resolution would then read—

Resolved, That all hearings on this subject before the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives be open to the public, and the final vote shall be a matter of public record.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment—in this particular matter I have no objection whatever to all the executive sessions being held public, as well as the final vote, but I do not like to create a precedent that there shall be no executive sessions of this committee. I believe that every vote of this committee upon any matter should be a matter of public record and the public right is fully safeguarded if the final vote is made a matter of public record, as I believe it always ought to be.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, the theory of this amending resolution is simply that a committee of Congress is a creature of Congress and its deliberations should be in public on all occasions. However, it only applies to this particular case, and I think that this resolution regarding woman's suffrage is a matter of such vital importance that it should be considered in open sessions of this committee. I feel that there can be no doubt but that Representatives in Congress, who are elected by the people—and the people are the sovereign power—I feel that there can be no doubt that the people have a right to have the attitude of their Representatives in committee known. I am perfectly willing to have a vote taken on this resolution, but I will certainly oppose any change in it permitting executive sessions on this proposition to be held behind closed doors, and I therefore hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will fail.

The CHAIRMAN. Those who are in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will manifest it by saying "aye." (The members of the committee in favor of the amendment voted "aye.")

The CHAIRMAN. Those who are opposed will say "no."

(The members of the committee opposed to the amendment voted "no.")

The CHAIRMAN. If you prefer a roll call, Mr. Kelly, we will have it.

Mr. KELLY. I ask for a roll call.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will call the roll.

(Upon roll call the following members voted "aye": Lenroot, Garrett, Foster, and Campbell. The following voted "no": Kelly. Not voting: Hardwick, Conry, Merritt, Cantrill, and Pou.)

The CHAIRMAN. The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is agreed to. Those in favor of the resolution as amended will say "aye"; opposed, "no."

The "ayes" have it, and the resolution is adopted.

Dr. Shaw, we will hear you now.

STATEMENT OF DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW.

Dr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Rules Committee, before addressing you may I address a word to my constituents here? I am quite sure that the ladies who are members of our association will understand the rules which govern here, and that is that they are not to call "louder" the person speaking, because those persons

are not addressing the audience, but are addressing the committee, and if they can not be heard by the audience, the audience must be very quiet and not interrupt, and there must be no applause during the hearing. I am saying this for our own women, and I am sure the visitors will gladly comply with the rules of the committee.

Our purpose in coming before you this morning is to make no attempt whatever to convert the members of the Rules Committee, if they need converting, to the democratic principle of the right of the people to have a voice in their own government. Our real purpose is to ask your committee to appoint a committee in the House on woman's suffrage, a committee which corresponds with the like committee of the Senate, in order that we may have hearings and have these hearings discussed by a committee which is not so burdened with other business as is the Committee on the Judiciary, the committee before which we have appeared for many years, and which is so burdened with other business—and the business of Congress, like everything else, is growing all the time—that we feel that this committee has not the time to consider our measure in the way in which it ought to be considered, since it is a measure of so vast importance, and in order that it may have the consideration which it deserves, the consideration which should be given to a question when in 10 States of the Union the men have enfranchised their women and those women are voting for Members of Congress and for the President of the United States, when all over the world similar bills have been passed in other legislative bodies and in other parliaments, when this question has been brought before various legislative bodies of the great nations of the world which have considered and voted upon it. It seems to the women of these United States that a question of so much importance that the parliaments of Europe feel under obligations to discuss and act upon it is at least of sufficient importance in this great Republic of ours, so that the committee which has it under consideration shall be such a committee as shall be able to give time to its consideration and report it to the House.

Year after year we have come to Congress asking the Judiciary Committee for a report. We have not asked the Judiciary Committee that they should believe in woman's suffrage or that they should express any opinion upon the question whatever. We have only asked that they would report our measure either favorably or unfavorably. We were so eager to have it reported that we were even anxious that they should report either for or against, anything to bring it before the Congress of the United States, in order that the representatives of the men of this country might be able to discuss it. It has thus far been impossible to secure any sort of a report by the Judiciary Committee. Now, we are not here to blame the Judiciary Committee; we are not here to criticize it. We realize that this is a body of men who have a great many questions before them, and that their time is taken up with the discussion of those questions, some of which they consider of more importance than the freedom of one-half of the people of the United States, and therefore we can not expect them to do more than they can, but if a committee is appointed for this specific purpose, I am quite sure it will be able to give time to its consideration and at least make a favorable or an unfavorable report to the lower House

of Congress. It is for this purpose that we appear before your honorable body to-day, and, as the first speaker, I would like to introduce, Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Helen Gardner, of the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HELEN GARDNER, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mrs. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Rules Committee, as I understand it, this hearing is not to be a forum for the discussion of the general question of woman suffrage, but is to be confined to the one point for which this committee has appointed this time for discussion, namely, whether or not the Rules Committee shall recommend to Congress the appointment of a committee on woman suffrage for the House of Representatives, whose duty it shall be to give such of its time and attention to this question as it shall find desirable or necessary.

This is not much for the women of America to ask of you. You may think of the expense. That is a mere trifle as compared with the millions of dollars which women pay and have paid to sustain this and other governmental committees, departments, and institution.

We are called upon to help pay for all of the others, why should we not have one of our own?

We do not hesitate to pay, or object to, the tax upon us for many and varied committees. Are men less generous and considerate of the needs and special interests of women?

You may remind me in this connection that for so many years—none of you gentlemen can recall when it was not so—we have been sent before the Judiciary Committee once a year for a constitutional amendment looking toward that end. You may say that the Judiciary Committee is a fine and able committee. In that, gentlemen, we agree with you and are not here to find fault with or to criticize the Judiciary Committee—a fine, able committee, of course. But our special needs and problems are not its object of existence. We are purely and solely a side issue to it. We appear before it, year after year, on one day for two hours, and that is the end of it. That committee is a very busy one. The President has notified it that it is to be still busier this session. He has even gone the length of giving its chairman notice that the heavy weight of this session is to fall upon the Judiciary Committee, even as the heavy weight of the special session just closed fell upon the Ways and Means Committee, and we all know that the work of that committee last session was entirely too heavy for it to have borne another straw. Those of us who live here and have known Congress from our childhood know that an outside issue would have less chance to get any real consideration by such a committee under such conditions than has the proverbial rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as never before, the Judiciary Committee is warned by the President that it is to be more heavily burdened during this Congress than is any other part of Congress. As never before, the question of woman suffrage, of the legal and political status of one-half of the population, is pressing for solution. There is and will be much beside and beyond the mere perfunctory yearly hearing henceforth until the end.

We need, as we never before needed, a special standing committee to look into many conditions, to familiarize itself with many points which the simple annual hearing does not involve.

Why, gentlemen, more than one-fifth of the Senate and more than one-seventh of the House to-day are elected by women's votes—yet we have not one little committee among the entire group of many.

More than one-sixth of the electoral vote comes from woman-suffrage States. At least one of the members of this Rules Committee was elected by the votes of women, and three other members come from States where campaigns are now on, and at least in one of these the chances are all on the side of our success.

Under these circumstances, and with the various questions involved, the rapidly developing and changing conditions, do you not realize that the committee for which we ask is overdue?

You will remember that there is a Committee on Indian Affairs. Now, why? Are the Indians so far more important than are all of the women of America? Are their affairs more vital?

They did not always have a special committee. They used to be a mere incident, as we now are. They used to be under the War Department, and so long as this was the case nobody ever doubted for an instant that the "only good Indian was a dead Indian"—just as under the incidental administration of the Judiciary Committee it is not doubted by some that the only good woman is a voteless woman. When the Indians got a committee of their own they began to get schools, lands in severalty, and the general status of human beings and not merely that of targets.

Now, I am not saying this in derogation of the War Department nor of the judiciary. It is a perfectly natural and a perfectly inevitable result of the situation.

It was the same general situation with labor before it achieved the dignity and status of having its own committee and now its department as well.

In the case of the Indians it was the business of the War Department to keep order. It was its business, when the Indians committed outrages or wandered from some special tract of land that had been designated by the Government or by the white settlers thereabouts as their "reservation," to chase them back, punish them for leaving it, and also for any depredations which they had committed. And, by the way, there is always an army of reactionaries to try to chase woman back to her "reservation" or "sphere" which somebody else has fixed for her in some passage and without her consent.

But when a special committee on Indian affairs was created it became the duty of that committee to begin back of the depredations and to inquire into what had caused the trouble, as well as the mere leaving of the reservation. In short, it became the duty of the committee to investigate the real condition, the needs, the grievances, and the best methods of promoting the interests of the Indians, as well as of keeping them in order from the side of mere force.

That was the beginning of the end of Indian wars. That was the first hope of a possibility—previously sneered at—of making real and useful citizens of this race of men and women from whom we now have Representatives in Congress side by side with you gentlemen.

It was precisely the same with our island possessions. Only in this case we had profited by our experience with our Indian and labor problems, and it did not take us so long to realize that a committee whose duty it should be to go "behind the returns," so to speak, in the matter of the best way to utilize, develop, and conserve the best interests of these new charges of our Government, and to develop them toward citizenship as rapidly as possible, was the safe and sane method of procedure. And, surprising as this may sound, there has now developed three separate and distinct standing committees in the Senate and one, at least, in the House, whose duty it is to look after some phase of the Indian question.

The situation is the same regarding our island possessions. There are now two insular committees in the Senate and one in the House, yet insular interests have been yours but a few years, the Indians but a few hundred years, and the special, unconsidered interest of women ever since the founding of our Government.

These insular and Indian committees are all standing committees. It is their duty to spend days and weeks and months to travel, if need be, to the islands or reservations, to investigate, to understand, and to conserve the interests of their special charges, and to try to bring these interests into harmony with our governmental affairs. It is their duty to really know the facts and to prevent, as far as possible, ex parte statements and representations from doing the harm that all such statements and half knowledge does.

We want such a committee on woman suffrage in the House. We do not ask you to appoint a partisan committee. We ask only for an open-minded, honest committee which will really investigate and understand the question of woman suffrage, its workings where it is in effect—a committee which will not accept wild statements as fact, which will hear and weigh that which comes from the side of progress and change as well as that which is static or reactionary.

If we are willing to put our case into such hands, what possible objection can be raised?

There is a so-called argument that only a limited percentage of women ask for this—although we represent over 4,000,000 women—but that is no argument at all, even were it true.

All of the Indians did not ask for nor want Indian committees. A very large majority of them did not.

Not a very large number of them were wise enough to desire it.

It is the same with the islanders, the Porto Ricans, Hawaiians, and the Filipinos. It is the same with women. It is only those who have vision beyond that which is, to that which might and should be, who always have led and who always will lead the race. It was so in your father's time and struggle for self-government. It is so in the struggle of the wives and daughters to-day toward the dignity and justice of personal liberty and self-government.

The few must lead the many to the light. Obstructionists always did and always will follow the footsteps of progress. The sophistry and timidity of those who cling to the past as the only stronghold of wisdom and virtue will always obstruct the path of those who are pushing forward.

The recommendation that we do have such a committee in the House of Representatives does not in any way commit you to the

adoption of a belief in the principle of self-government for women as a part of your own mental equipment. It merely says that you are willing to recommend that the mothers of the race, your wives, daughters, mothers, and sisters shall have in the lower branch of the Congress of the United States, as they have in the Senate, one committee to which they may go freely, and as often as the rapidly changing problems, difficulties, and conditions shall demand. That it shall be the duty of this committee to really investigate, understand, and know fundamentally the legal and political status and the anomalous situation of one-half of all the citizens and to act for their best interests and development in a Government which they help to support.

This is not much to ask, and it is not much to give, nor will it be needed for very many more years.

The Democratic Party has the opportunity of a century. It has it in its own hands to make the women of all lands for all time its debtors and admirers, and to make of its profession of "a government of the people, by the people, for the people" a reality and not an iridescent dream for one-half of that people.

But whether the Democratic Party is ready for this step or not it is surely not so blind as to deny the right to one-half of these people to have a very little part of its own tax money expended for one single committee whose duty it shall be to look into, with patience and honest effort, the present very unequal and anomalous situation and help to discover such remedies as may seem sane and in harmony with the twentieth century.

When I go to California with my husband I am a voter and a unit. I have a legal and political status as a sane, individual citizen.

When we return to my State of Virginia I promptly become a cipher and he is the only unit in our family. I do not like that. He does not like it.

There are now these absurd anomalies for ever 4,000,000 women. Their property is involved, as well as their sense of dignity and justice.

You have given the Indians and islanders now several committees to look into and adjust similar and less oppressive questions and conditions. Are we less to you than are they?

And in speaking of my own State of Virginia, Mr. Chairman, I am reminded that your own great ancestor, of whom all Virginians are so proud, expressed for men—he no doubt thought he was expressing it for all mankind—the sentiment which burns in every human breast if that human being has arrived at a sane and self-respecting human status and is not mentally a mere pawn in the discard of humanity.

Your great ancestor, the immortal Patrick Henry, said, that which we women echo to-day, "Give me liberty or give me death." He meant it. We mean it. His descendants are justly proud of him, as are all Virginians. Their pride rests upon the fact that he stood for liberty and progress, for the furthest forward-reach of his time.

The descendants of the men of to-day will search the history of our time for the acts of you men of to-day that they may be proud of the blood that courses in their veins, even as you look back and

are proud, not of the reactionary, the halting, or the feeble acts of your forefathers, but of the acts that made of this land the beacon of liberty to the world.

One little step toward that liberty is this committee which you have it in your hands, in large part, to give.

Shall we ask it of you in vain? Shall your descendants point with pride or with chagrin to your grasp of the fundamental principles of self-government, of liberty, of democracy?

Dr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I wish to present as our next speaker Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, than whom, I doubt, if there is anyone in the United States more familiar with this subject from her own journeys to the National Capitol to attend hearings before the Judiciary Committee. Mrs. Harper is the editor of the four-volume *Woman's Suffrage History* and the biographer of Mrs. Susan B. Anthony.

STATEMENT OF MRS. IDA HUSTED HARPER, OF NEW YORK.

Mrs. HARPER: Gentlemen, this is not the time or place to enter into an argument on the merits or demerits of woman suffrage, and we shall use the valuable hours you have so graciously accorded us simply to ask that you will give us a committee of our very own, before which we may feel that we have a right to discuss this question. In making this request we ask you to decide, first, whether the issue of woman suffrage is sufficiently national in its character to justify a special committee for its consideration; second, whether it has been so fairly treated by the committee which has had it in charge for 44 years that another is not necessary; and, third, whether justice requires that it should come under the jurisdiction of Congress.

In nine States and one Territory women now possess the franchise on exactly the same terms as men; in one State, Illinois, they have the presidential, the municipal, a considerable county and township suffrage, and a vote on all questions submitted to the electors; in five States they vote on special taxation, issuing of bonds, etc.; in one-half the States they have school suffrage. There are now in the United States 1,500,000 women who are completely enfranchised and about 4,000,000 who may vote for presidential electors. This number is likely to be increased, as four States—Nevada, Montana, North and South Dakota—will vote in 1914 on woman suffrage amendments to their constitutions. The legislatures of eight other States this year gave a majority vote in favor of submitting such an amendment. Eighteen Members of the United States Senate and nearly forty in the House of Representatives have women constituents. Organizations representing several million men and not less than a million women have officially indorsed the enfranchisement of women. In every State except South Carolina women are organized in a greater or less degree to obtain the franchise. These facts are submitted to prove that woman suffrage is a national question and entitled to consideration by a special committee in the National House of Representatives.

Second. Has the treatment of this question by the committee to which it has always been referred been such as to warrant a continuance of this custom? The National Woman Suffrage Association

was formed in 1869 for the express purpose of obtaining an amendment to the Federal Constitution. Its representatives went before the congressional committees that year and have continued to do so at each new Congress since that time, never having been refused a hearing. At the beginning of 1882 both Senate and House created special woman suffrage committees. The Senate has continuously maintained this committee, but in 1884 the House declined to renew it by a vote of 124 nays, 85 yeas; 112 not voting. The debate was long and heated and almost wholly on the question of woman suffrage itself. Thenceforth the women appeared before the House Judiciary Committee, which, although busy and overworked, had always a good representation present and was respectful and often cordial.

The ablest women this country has produced have appeared before this committee, including Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone, Mary B. Clay of Kentucky; Julia Ward Howe, Elizabeth B. Meriwether of Tennessee, Isabella Beecher Hooker, Caroline E. Merrick of New Orleans, Frances E. Willard, Virginia L. Minor of Missouri—the list is far too long to quote, and nearly all of these named have passed away with their dream for women unfulfilled, and leaving to this generation a legacy of work and faith. Repeatedly the eminent members of this Judiciary Committee have said that no hearings before them were conducted with such dignity and ability as those of the advocates of woman suffrage. And what is the result? Six reports in forty-four years and five of these unfavorable!

Does the record end here? No; for there has been no report of any kind since 1894. For the last 20 years the women of this Nation have made an annual pilgrimage to Washington to plead their cause before a committee which has forgotten their existence as soon as they were out of sight. Within the past five years there is scarcely a parliament of a civilized country in the whole world that has not had before it the question of woman's enfranchisement, and yet never once in the entire history of the United States has this question been considered by its lower House of Congress, supposedly the direct representatives of the whole people. Gentleman of the Committee on Rules, will you not give to women a committee of their own that will not ignore them for half a century?

Third. It seems appropriate at this time to consider for a moment whether woman suffrage should come under the jurisdiction of Congress or be vested entirely in the States. The Federal Constitution expressly provides for the election of the Members of the House of Representatives and gives Congress the power to alter this provision. This body will soon act on a bill which determines who shall vote for United States Senators. Thus far there is undoubtedly national control of the suffrage. The convention which framed the Federal Constitution necessarily had to make it one of compromise on many points, but they were absolutely unable to agree on the qualifications for exercising the suffrage.

So heated was the debate that, according to history, Benjamin Franklin had to call for prayer. The only possible end was to leave the Constitution silent on the subject, except to provide for the election of the National Congress, and the matter therefore was left with the individual States. The entire status of woman has changed since then, and ethical and social questions have entered into politics

which could not have been foreseen. It is inevitable that this Constitution must occasionally be amended to meet new conditions, while leaving its fundamental and vital provisions undisturbed. The advocates of woman suffrage believe that it should now be changed so as to give a voice in governmental matters to a half of the people which has become an important factor in the public life of the Nation. By the only means now available the half which possesses the ballot has the absolute authority over its further extension, and no ruling class likes to divide its power. State rights are desirable to a very large extent when all the people of the State have a voice, but it is not in harmony with the spirit of our Republic that one half of the citizens of a State should have complete power over the political liberty of the other half.

Without entering into any argument, two or three concrete examples will illustrate how unreasonably this power may be used. In 1887 the Legislature of New Jersey gave school suffrage to women in villages and country districts, but after they had exercised it seven years the Supreme Court decided that the legislature had exceeded its rights and the constitution of the State must be amended. To preserve this scrap of a vote the women organized and began a campaign, and, since this was necessary, they asked that the new bill might include also school suffrage for women in the cities, but this was refused. By a technicality they had to get the bill through three legislatures, but finally by much hard work, the expenditure of a great deal of money, and a petition of 7,000 they succeeded in having the question submitted. There was not the slightest criticism of the way women had used their school franchise for seven years; there was no organized opposition from those interests which usually defeat the full suffrage, and yet on this simple proposition to restore to women in the villages and country districts the right to vote for school trustees over 75,000 men voted "no," and it was defeated by more than 10,000 majority.

To show that this was not due to any so-called "eastern conservatism," consider a case in South Dakota. While it was a Territory women were permitted to vote for all school officers, and it was supposed that this privilege was continued in its State constitution. It was soon found, however, that by its provisions they could no longer vote for State and county superintendents, and therefore an amendment for this purpose had to be submitted to the electors. This was done in 1893, but, although the women had already been voting many years for those officers with no criticism, about 22,700 men voted "no" and the amendment was defeated by a majority of 5,672.

Permit another instance, which occurred in Massachusetts last month. So carefully are women excluded from office in this State that it is necessary to amend the constitution in order that they may be notaries public. They have for many years asked the legislature to submit such an amendment, and this year it was done, but it was overwhelmingly defeated by about 30,000—181,343 men voting against it—although every other amendment voted on at that election was carried.

To show the difficulties of a referendum of any extension of political rights to women in any section of the country, take the case of Louisiana, where a year or two ago a constitutional amendment to

permit women to serve on school and other public boards was submitted. It was said to have been defeated by a large majority, but so determined were the election commissioners that this "entering wedge" should not be allowed that it led to their being indicted for fraud by the grand jury. It was found that the law did not require an official count of constitutional amendments, and the true result probably never will be known.

Women have been defeated over twenty times in the strongest campaigns they were able to make for full-suffrage amendments to State constitutions. From 1896 to 1910 they were not once successful. Sometimes they were sold out by the party "machines" at the last moment; sometimes they were counted out after they had really secured a majority; but whatever the reason, they lost. The victories of the last three years may be cited as evidence that henceforth they will succeed. Those victories were largely due to political conditions which do not exist in many other States, and against them must be set the crushing defeats in Ohio, Wisconsin, and Michigan, where the woman-suffrage amendment was fought by every vicious interest which menaces the body politic. These same interests have been the cause of defeat in every State where amendments have been lost.

Gentlemen of the committee, you have not forgotten the woman-suffrage parade in Washington last spring, when troops from Fort Myer had to be summoned to protect the women from the mob that closed in upon them. If you could have been in that procession and looked into the faces of that jeering, insulting, half-drunken line of men you would have realized what the mothers, wives, and daughters of this country are subjected to when they are compelled to plead with the individual voters to grant them the suffrage. Create for us our own committee, who will not be too busy or too indifferent to give our case the attention to which it is entitled—a committee whose appointment will hold out to us the hope that ultimately our question will be considered by the National Congress, which is elected to represent all the people, women as well as men.

Dr. SHAW. The next speaker, Mr. Chairman, is a woman who does not need to be introduced to any civilized human being, not because she has been noted for any political agitation, but for the service she has rendered to humanity; a service which is considered distinctly woman's service, and in this work which she has done for her State and country she long ago came to realize that it was absolutely impossible to accomplish it unless she and other women who labored with her had the ballot. I take pleasure in introducing to this committee Miss Jane Addams, of Chicago.

STATEMENT OF MISS JANE ADDAMS, OF CHICAGO, ILL.

Miss ADDAMS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I had the honor of appearing before you last August as a woman voter when you very kindly received the delegation of woman voters who were meeting here in Washington. With your permission I will refer to a little discussion at that time, and to a point which the committee made, and which seemed to me at the moment well taken, that the Rules Committee had no power to appoint a committee on

woman's suffrage because of the fact that Congress did not have jurisdiction over the question of the franchise; that it was a matter for each State to determine by the electors within the borders of that State. The point was made by the gentlemen from Georgia [Mr. Hardwick], and the only exception I was able to give him was that of the fifteenth amendment, and I realized, of course, that that was not an apt instance to give to a gentleman from Georgia. Since that time, through the courtesy of our president, I have been able to get together nine other instances in which Congress in its official capacity has designated the conditions under which citizens of the United States may exercise the prerogative of their citizenship. Of course, these various classes of citizens have lived within the borders of States and Territories, and those States and Territories did not consider that their States' rights were interfered with when Congress made these conditions.

The second instance—I still retain the fifteenth amendment as the first instance—the second instance is that of the Indians. You know, of course, that for many years the Indians were the wards of the Nation, and when tribal relations were broken up they were given suffrage. This suffrage was given to them not by the various States in which the reservations were situated, but by the United States, by the Congress of this country.

Mr. HARDWICK. That was while these different Territorial divisions were Territories of the United States, and therefore Congress has always prescribed the terms of suffrage and designated who should exercise it in the Territories of the United States.

Miss ADDAMS. Then we would be very happy if they would give the franchise to all the women in the Territories upon that same instance.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course Congress has that power.

Miss ADDAMS. Then I will only call that half of an illustration. I was going to say that there used to be four classes of people who could not vote—Indians, imbeciles, criminals, and women. Now you have taken away the Indian, so there are only imbeciles, criminals, and women who are left.

The third one, perhaps not a very happy one, is that of the Confederate soldiers who took the oath of allegiance after the war was over, and their oath of allegiance was prescribed by Congress.

The fourth instance is that of foreigners who fought in the Civil War. They were not obliged to go through the process of naturalization, but were given citizenship by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HARDWICK. The acts by which they were given citizenship did not give them the right to vote, because citizenship and the right to vote are very clearly separate and distinct propositions of law. Women are now citizens of the United States.

Miss ADDAMS. Then I will withdraw that as an illustration.

The fifth instance is that of men who are disfranchised when they are put into a Federal penitentiary. When they come out it lies with Congress to give them the right to vote. They are deprived of it when they are sent to the penitentiary.

Mr. HARDWICK. No; they are deprived of it by State law in each case.

Miss ADDAMS. Why would they be deprived of it by State law?

Mr. HARDWICK. Because the laws of the different States provide that where a man has been guilty of felonies involving moral turpitude he shall, for that reason, lose the right to vote.

Miss ADDAMS. But I am talking about Federal prisoners.

Mr. HARDWICK. It is just the same, if the offense involves moral turpitude.

Miss ADDAMS. Would you like to have that answered by my attorney?

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, no. If it bothers you I will not continue.

Miss ADDAMS. No; it does not bother me in the least.

The sixth one, which I have down here and which I am advancing with a little less confidence, is the direct vote for United States Senator, recently voted upon by Congress, and the conditions under which that vote is taken are being prescribed by Congress. Is that right?

Mr. LENROOT. It is not within the field of Congress to provide for the electors when we provided for the direct vote for the Senators.

Miss ADDAMS. Then, deserters from the Army are deprived of their vote. Perhaps we can put that on a matter of congressional action. Is that right?

Mr. HARDWICK. I am not sure. You have me there.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Miss ADDAMS. Next are the naturalized citizens, immigrants who come to this country owing allegiance to the countries from which they come and who are naturalized under conditions prescribed by the Federal Government and not by the various States. I am quite sure about that.

Mr. HARDWICK. There is this objection to that. While they are naturalized, and naturalization is one of the conditions precedent to the conferring of the suffrage, suffrage is not necessarily conferred by naturalization, and there are other things which the State regulates and which must enter into it after naturalization.

Miss ADDAMS. The naturalization is a necessary proposition and must come from the Federal Government?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; but the mere fact that a person is naturalized does not entitle that person necessarily to the right to vote. The fact that they are naturalized simply makes them citizens, just as the women are citizens to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. I think in the case of deserters from the Army, only the President can remove the disabilities—Congress or the President. The President frequently does it by virtue of an act of Congress.

Miss ADDAMS. Yes; Congress has jurisdiction in the matter. That was my point. Then there is another thing which Congress regulates, and that is the wives of foreigners or naturalized citizens. If a woman born in America marries a foreigner, a man of English birth we will say, who does not care to take out naturalization papers, she, of course, is a citizen of England and loses her right to vote if she is living in an equal-suffrage State such as California or Illinois. That, of course, is a Federal regulation.

Then, the tenth I have here perhaps you will not admit, although it seems to some of us a very good instance. In 1872, Miss Anthony, who lived in Rochester, was very insistent to test woman's right to

vote under the fourteenth amendment, which said that "any citizen born or naturalized," and so forth. She went to the polls in Rochester and voted. She was not arrested by the local authorities in Rochester or by any State officer, but she was arrested by a Federal officer on the ground that she had violated the election conditions, the election laws of the Federal Government. She was neither convicted nor pardoned; she was held in a state of suspense, as it were, and such action as was taken, was taken by the Federal authority.

Mr. HARDWICK. Do you know why that was?

Miss ADDAMS. No.

Mr. HARDWICK. It was because at that time the force law was in effect. That regulated during the days of reconstruction.

Miss ADDAMS. In New York?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; all over the Union. It affected the suffrage exercised in every State of the Union.

Miss ADDAMS. She was arrested for voting for a Member of Congress.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; undoubtedly she could not have been arrested for voting for a State official.

Miss ADDAMS. Some of my instances are poor, but such as they are they show the point that we made during the last Congress before your committee. At that time the committee took the position that the Federal Government had no jurisdiction in the matter of laying down conditions of franchise for the citizens of the various States; that it was a matter for State regulation; but I believe that these instances all show that in certain cases, under certain conditions, the Federal Government did interfere in the matter of the franchise of citizens in the various States. Now, if it is even remotely, even partially a matter of Federal authority, then we claim that we ought to have a committee to take up this matter. If the Rules Committee felt that it was something that did not concern Congress then one could quite understand why they refused to appoint it. But if it does concern Congress, if it is a concern of Congress, even under extraordinary conditions we believe that there should be a committee appointed for this specific purpose. We claim that there has been an extraordinary condition in America in the last 10 years in regard to the enfranchisement of women, and we have every right to expect that the number will be doubled in the next two years, with the wave of public opinion which is sweeping over the country. We think that the Rules Committee ought to appreciate this situation and give us a special committee to take up this very important subject.

I shall be very glad to answer any questions or to take back anything which I have said which can not be substantiated, but in general I claim that the instances I have cited show that the Government has taken up this matter in times past, and now is the moment for them to take it up again.

Mr. LENROOT. Let me suggest there that the jurisdiction of Congress is, of course, limited within the powers mentioned by the Constitution itself.

Mr. HARDWICK. Your claim would have to rest on that, I think.

Miss ADDAMS. I was not asking for an amendment to the Constitution at this time. We should like the committee appointed by the House to recommend an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. HARDWICK. I just want to suggest one thing there. We have a committee already in the House that is not very busy and which has, according to my notion of the rules, absolute jurisdiction over this subject, to wit, the Committee on Election of President and Vice President and Representatives in Congress. Would it not be just as satisfactory to you ladies to let that committee, if it can do so under the rules of the House, take charge of your matter? They will have ample time to attend to it.

Miss ADDAMS. I should like to have the president speak on such an important matter as that.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it be satisfactory if the committee would add woman's suffrage to its authority, so that its title would be, "Committee on Election of President and Vice President, Representatives in Congress, and Woman's Suffrage"?

Dr. SHAW. So far as we are concerned, we are perfectly satisfied with a committee that will consider our case, if that committee has plenty of time to do so. We only ask for a committee that has time to consider the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Rucker, of Missouri, is the chairman of that committee. Perhaps you would like to know how he stands on the suffrage question?

Dr. SHAW. No; we are not so much concerned in knowing how the chairman stands as we are in that the committee will let Congress know how the country stands. May I ask the gentleman who objected to the point made by Miss Addams in regard to the enfranchisement of Indians, stating that this was done under Territorial regulation, if it did not also apply to Indians living in States, like New York and Massachusetts? Were those Indians not recognized as citizens?

Mr. HARDWICK. Congress could never have conferred the right to vote in New York. It may have conferred the right of citizenship, but the right to vote has nowhere been conferred by congressional action in any State of the Union. However, there are some inhibitions in the Federal Constitution against withholding the right to vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the present terms of the Constitution, if Congress should conclude to take charge of the election of Representatives and Senators in Congress, could Congress enact a law conferring the elective franchise on women as well as men?

Mr. HARDWICK. That might be possible, although I would say that is a question which raises the constitutionality of that proposition.

Mr. Pou. I would like to ask Dr. Shaw just one question. Did I understand you to say a moment ago that you would be entirely satisfied if this committee should arrange under the rules of the House to specifically give to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress jurisdiction over the woman-suffrage question? I consider that this is a serious matter, and my own inclination is to give to the question a fair consideration, and I would like to find out specifically whether or not it would be entirely satisfactory to you.

Dr. SHAW. I have not consulted with the other members of my board, or with our convention, but I am quite sure that we would agree that whatever committee was given us should be a committee

which had sufficient time and considered the question of sufficient importance to give it sufficient time so that we could have a clear discussion of the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Since that question has been raised, I think we should be perfectly candid about it. That committee is composed of 13 members, I think, and is not a busy committee at all. They meet infrequently and would have an abundance of time to consider the question, and the Committee on Rules will seriously submit the question to you and your executive board, whether or not that would be acceptable to you, for the reason that it is a committee that is not very busy and has jurisdiction, or may be given jurisdiction to specifically recognize that subject.

Dr. SHAW. Will you permit me to ask you to defer action as to that until I have consulted with my associates?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. POU. We would like to know whether or not it would be as satisfactory to you ladies to confer that jurisdiction on the committee that the chairman has mentioned, as it would be to ask for a new committee.

Dr. SHAW. Immediately after the close of the hearing I will try to consult the members of my official board, and as many members of the convention as we can, and give you a reply.

Mr. LENROOT. In that connection, you or your board may not be aware of the fact—I think it is a fact—that the present committee is treated as a minor one. I believe that is the fact.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. On the contrary, during this session—I served on it eight years, and it is really a very important committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Then I will withdraw that statement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was just going to suggest that it will be a very busy one if it takes up the suggestion made by the President yesterday with regard to nominations of candidates for President and Vice President. That is a question of sufficient importance to require a large portion of their attention.

The CHAIRMAN. I will state, Dr. Shaw, that the House is a little averse to creating new committees. They abolished six or eight some time ago, but if this committee has the time they might have an additional force—clerical force, and so forth—to go ahead with the work that they would be called upon to do if this jurisdiction was given them.

Dr. SHAW. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the time has come when the committee which takes up our question should not be a minor one—a committee that never meets, a dead committee, or anything of that sort—and I assure you that the committee that has it will be alive if there is any power in women to quicken their spirit. We had intended to introduce a gentleman in the middle of the list here, but he is evidently busy now, but will be in later. Judge Baker, of California, was to speak at this point, but he will probably be in a little later, so I will introduce next Mrs. Desha Breckinridge, whose great-grandfather was one of the greatest statesmen that was ever born in the United States or anywhere else. Mrs. Desha Breckinridge is the great-granddaughter of Henry Clay, and therefore we are very glad to have a descendent of Henry Clay speak in behalf of justice for the womanhood of America.

STATEMENT OF MRS. DESHA BRECKENRIDGE, OF KENTUCKY.

Mrs. BRECKENRIDGE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this committee, the Supreme Court of the United States has acknowledged that women are citizens and the supreme court in Canada has acknowledged that we are people, and since the men of this Nation, in every part of it, are becoming really, dimly, in a somewhat subconscious state to realize that we do constitute a part of the human family, it seems fitting that we should give the United States Government an opportunity again to realize the principle upon which it is founded—that just governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed. It seems appropriate that we should allow the United States Government to make the amende honorable in this matter, and not leave it to the State governments.

When I was asked last year to speak before this committee I know it was not because anything that I might bring to your attention would be particularly pleasing or enlightening to the gentlemen of the committee, but because I represented a section that is not usually supposed to favor a constitutional amendment. Now, I think it may be valuable for me to state here that I believe a constitutional amendment granting suffrage to women would be of advantage to my State and also to the other Southern States, and so, to that end, we ask for a committee of this House to consider the question of woman's suffrage, and we believe it of sufficient importance to the Nation to correct this glaring deficiency in the Constitution. We believe it sufficiently important to the men of this country, not alone to the women, but to the men, that there should be a special committee of the House to consider this subject.

The State of Kentucky has an honorable record in the matter of democracy. When we wrote our first constitution we threw off the traditions of Virginia. We did not believe citizenship should be dependent upon any accident of birth or inheritance of wealth or educational opportunity. We based suffrage on manhood alone, and the Western States who modeled their constitutions after ours followed that precedent. In the same way, the men of my State when they wrote the first school law, in 1838, made the first step of any English-speaking people in the modern movement for the emancipation of women. Now, I have to assent that the men of my State are classing the women of my State, legally and politically, with idiots and criminals. They are now awakening to the fact, however, that in many ways they need the help of their women, and it is because I believe Kentucky and all the Southern States need tremendously the help of their women that I am empowered to plead with the United States Government to make it possible for them to give this help. We are looked upon somewhat contemptuously by the Northern States when we give the war as an excuse for any condition of the present day, but I think it may still be given as an excuse for the fact that in many ways we are a backwoods people. The war swept away our wealth—our whole economic system—and not only that, it left us with the burdens of war and the reconstruction period to bear. It also left us, some one has said in an inspired moment, to take care of two races out of the poverty of one. But the war also swept off the flower of our manhood. In my own State, Kentucky, you will remember that it believed in State rights, but believed even

more in the preservation of the Union. My own people, since I have been referred to here, were typical of the other families of the State, in that they gave the best blood of their family in that war.

My great-grandfather, who was a war maker in his youth, who perhaps more than any other one man forced the War of 1812, and therefore, perhaps justly, had the somewhat difficult task of making peace, which was made before the news arrived of the battle of New Orleans, in the latter years of his life fought always for peace, and however we may feel about the compromise bill, however we may feel about the attitude which he took toward the Mexican War, we know what he did toward the preservation of the Union. Until the time that war was made he was a concrete factor in the maintaining of that Union. You know that the position that Kentucky took was a factor in the preservation of the Union. Prof. Taylor says, in his history, when he approaches this delicate subject of Kentucky's neutrality, "There are States which it might be necessary to defend from the charge of cowardice. Kentucky is not one." Kentucky gave her full quota to the armies of both sides in that war. The son of Henry Clay lost his life in the Mexican War, and the two sons of young Henry Clay lost their lives in the war between the two parts of the Union, one of them in the armies of the North and one in the armies of the South. Now, is it any excuse for the backwoods position of Kentucky or of any other of the Southern States? Is it any excuse for having the greatest percentage of illiteracy in the country? I think it is. I think it is an excuse, and I repeat it often to myself when I take the facts that are presented, when I take the statistics that are damning to Kentucky, the educational statistics that place Kentucky at the very bottom of every table. There is one table in which, taking our native-born white men, the voting population, we are third from the bottom of the list. When we throw in the children and women and negroes we come up considerably, but taking only our voting white men we are in this position in the table. When the census of 1900 came out a man from North Carolina was looking for his State upon the list, and he finally found that there was one State below him, the State of New Mexico. Until he made this discovery he had been greatly depressed, but after finding that there was one State below him he lifted up his head and said, "Thank God for New Mexico."

Kentucky could thank God for North Carolina, with her whites and blacks, and for New Mexico with her hybrid Spanish and Indian population. But while we were talking about granting the liberty of equal suffrage to women, New Mexico did it, and I feared then to see the table for 1910, and when I did see it I saw that we could no longer thank God for New Mexico, for there were only two States below us. We were in extreme danger of dropping off the column entirely. When we come to health statistics, we find that in the percentage of blindness to the population there are only three States below us. When we come to tuberculosis, we find that we rank ahead in relative prominence. I must say this, since we have gone into these vital statistics, and since we have decided to know ourselves in order that we may improve conditions, our climate does not give us an excuse for this prominence in tuberculosis, and it is undoubtedly due to our own carelessness and ignorance and slothfulness.

Now, when our men have attempted to better conditions in our own State in many lines, we have tried to aid, even by the indirect means in our power. We women have tried to aid, side by side with our men, and the fact that our men have recognized that help is instanced by the passage of several recent laws. We have a law creating a State labor commission, with annual appropriations from the State revenue; a law creating a State commission on forestry, with annual appropriations from the State revenues; a law creating a tuberculosis commission. In all of these laws creating commissions which shall spend the public money of the State of Kentucky, the men of Kentucky have stated that these commissions shall consist of men and women.

Now, why? Simply because the men who wrote those laws, or who helped to write them and worked for them, realized that if the money was to be spent for the best good of Kentucky it must be spent by those most interested in the welfare of the State, and that those people were both men and women. This shows that her men are dimly conscious of the fact that if Kentucky is to right herself, is to assume her old prominence of leadership, if she is to be again the pioneer intellectually as she was geographically we must have not one-half of the people working for Kentucky, but all the people working together with a long and strong pull. And that is why I do not feel I am doing any injustice to the men of my State in asking this Federal amendment, in asking the help of the Congress of the United States. I believe that I am doing them a great favor—a favor which they themselves will appreciate.

Now, some years ago when we were working for our school-suffrage law, after we had worked for it at three sessions of the legislature and had at last gotten it past the house and up to the senate, only three days before adjournment a letter was sent to the members of the senate by the German-American Alliance, calling upon the men of Kentucky to protect the homes and womanhood of Kentucky, and saying that the German alliance believed that the home was the sphere for women. When we investigated we found that the German-American Alliance was the brewers' alliance, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky. We wondered if these Germans had forgotten that the women of Kentucky came from the same strain as the men of Kentucky; that it was a protesting blood; that it was a blood that had left its native shores and come to an alien land because it denied the right of any nation, through their government, to impose the burdens of government upon them without the rights of government, and our men in the legislature agreed with us that we should decide that our sphere followed our children into our schools.

So I believe that the men of Kentucky are going to decide that woman's sphere follows her children out of school and wherever those children go. And I would suggest to the men of this committee, who I understand are southern men, that if they object to the suffrage for women being forced upon them by the United States Government, that there is still time in which they may go home and give it to their women in the States; and I suggest to the United States Government that if it prefers itself to right this old injustice to women, to take out of our Federal Constitution the glaring inconsistency that it now contains, and which must be done by Congress,

or the State of Kentucky will have the bad manners of some of the western States and proceed to do this job for it.

Dr. SHAW. Our next speaker, Mr. Chairman, is Judge Raker, of California.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN E. RAKER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am not ordinarily placed in a position where I have to apologize before a committee of this kind. I was not aware that the committee was to meet this morning, although there was general information of it, but I had so many other matters to attend to that it escaped my attention.

I want to say to you, gentlemen, that I am not going into the subject discussed by the lady who just preceded me. Such a statement of facts by one from that territory would be out of the way, but it is only an indication of conditions as illustrated by a conversation I heard the other night when coming from New Orleans to Washington, when I met a number of men on the train. There were 10 or 15 university men from the southern universities in the car. They said that they were beginning to recognize the fact that only half of the strength and mentality of this Anglo-Saxon blood had been recognized in their southern States. With the women, so many of them standing for this right; with the college men of the South; with the virile blood from the West, which is made up of all the peoples of the United States and the Middle West—as I said then and as I say now, just so surely as this gathering is here to-day, the women of this Nation are bound to have within a very short space of time the right to exercise their freedom and give their voice to home government, to alleviate and avoid the very conditions that this young lady says exist in the southern States and which exist all over the United States and which ought to be relieved. But I am going to devote my time, gentlemen, to the one condition that is before the committee and to the one thing that I believe this committee ought to determine and ought to consider, outside of whether or not any man believes or disbelieves in the right that the women should have to exercise their privileges as human beings the same as men, and that is the appointment of a committee by the House of Representatives.

It will be said, and will be said in advance, that there is a committee already organized in the House to which these bills relating to the women's right to vote would go, and that they could dispose of it; in other words, the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. Gentlemen, that committee has a distinct function; it has a distinct work to perform for the purpose of investigating the bills that may be presented relative to the election of the President and the Vice President and Members of the House of Representatives, and there will be many of such bills at this session. Some of probably the most important bills that have been introduced since the beginning of this Government will go to that committee for their consideration and their investigation and their action, and the same is true relative to the committees on election of Members to Congress. This is a question

of whether or not the women of this land should be recognized by the House of Representatives to the end that they might present the question of whether or not there are facts justifying its consideration; whether or not upon the other hand the facts are such that they should not be given this right; and can any fair-minded man for one instant name or present a reasonable objection, that if a bill is introduced asking that they should be given the right of equal suffrage, or the right that their brothers have, that that right should not be granted, not only from the States that give women the right to vote to-day but from the States that may be the most opposed to it. The reasons why women should vote ought to be gathered together; they ought to be presented intelligently before a committee of the House just like any other fact is presented before a committee having jurisdiction of that bill, so that those who are in favor of that legislation might present fully, fairly, and completely all the facts showing their cause; and, upon the other hand, every one who is opposed, should have an opportunity to present their facts, that these general statements might not only be put on the record and embodied in the record but the witnesses, those who go from one association to another association making statements without a foundation of fact to bear them out; those that come to the East from the West and state what the condition has been in the West, as to the right of women to vote—I say that when you come to place them upon the witness stand and ascertain the facts, you will find 99 per cent of every word they say relative to what has been the condition of the right of women to vote in California is not substantiated by facts.

I say that these American women have the right to have those facts fully and fairly presented to the House that they may be considered by the committee, and if the committee in its wisdom and judgment sees fit to report a bill to the House guaranteeing those rights, not only to the men, but to the women, after going into the matter in detail, they ought to have that right; they ought to be given that privilege, and that is my position as I stand before this committee to-day.

Suppose we find a State where there is no right granted to the women to vote. There are two sides—those who claim one state of facts to exist and that it would be the ruination of that State and its laws and its municipalities. Ought not the other side have the right to present their facts to the committee, so that you may have not only the statistical facts as to the health conditions, the condition of the children, the condition of the women, the condition of their method of working and their treatment, and all that, and what the result would be if these were eliminated, and this would be changed if the women were given the right to participate. One-half of the population of every community would have the right to participate to bring about better laws, and should they not have the right to appear before a committee of the House, whose business, whose creation is for the purpose of investigating those conditions, that they might report to the House? If you have a little bill in relation to quarantine, it goes to the proper committee. You have a committee on whether or not cattle should be transported across the line, and legislation upon it, and whether or not calves should be killed, which goes to a proper committee with jurisdiction to examine and report, and it is proper

and all right that it should be done. You have a committee in relation to public lands, as to what should be done with them, and it goes to that committee with direct jurisdiction to hear the facts, subpoena witnesses, and go fully into it, and, if it becomes necessary, to send the committee to where those facts exist, so that there may be full opportunity to present them, that the members of the committee may have the testimony upon which to act.

Now, can there be any objection to the creation of a proper committee to which this matter may be referred? I do not care how a man may feel; I care not what his predilections may be as to the determination of whether or not the women should have the right to vote eventually, but I can not reiterate too often and call it to your attention too particularly that these petitioners should have a fair opportunity. It has been one of the boasts of this Government, and it is one of the fundamental principles of this Government that we will not condemn any man and we will not judge anyone until we have given him, or her, as the case may be, an opportunity to be heard. The American spirit and the American people revolt from the idea of judging a man or judging a condition without hearing both sides, and without a full, open, and fair hearing. *Ex parte* hearing has passed and gone so far as this country is concerned, and I wish to reiterate that it seems to me that it is so easy, it is so simple, it is so just, and it is so right that no one for an instant ought to hesitate to appoint a committee to investigate, to give them the power to investigate, to give them the power that when bills are referred to them that relate to this particular subject they may go into it in full and in detail, and whether that committee reports to-morrow, next year, or two years hence, I am satisfied that there is not one woman within the hearing of my voice, or in the United States, but who would be satisfied, if she is fair minded and reasonable, and ninety-nine and one-half of the women are fair minded, that if she is given a full, fair hearing and an opportunity to present her case she will be willing to abide her time, and willing to abide the judgment and result of the investigation of those who are willing to pass upon this matter. We ask only that you give us a chance to be heard, and give us an opportunity for the proper consideration of our cause. Then, when you have done that, you have done just what you have done in every case that comes before this committee; you have done the same thing that occurs every time any matter comes before the House.

Gentlemen, I do not want to take your time to go into detail as to why the women should be entitled to vote. It has become a fact, so clear and so certain to my mind from actual experience in the West, that it seems to me upon an investigation that no one could raise an objection or a voice against that right, but I want to pass that by, because that is not what this committee is going to determine; that is not what this committee is asked to determine. I wish to illustrate this, and then I am through, gentlemen: Supposing a bill upon a new subject was presented to Congress. Many men might be opposed to it. The Speaker may be doubtful as to what committee it should go to; it is of considerable importance. Does anyone doubt that if a resolution were presented in the House and submitted to the Rules Committee and the matter was taken up in the Rules Committee and they should say, "There is grave doubt which committee of the

House this particular resolution or bill should be presented to, but we think it is of importance; with our American spirit we recognize that both sides are entitled to be heard, and we will report to the House that a committee be appointed to investigate and consider that subject." Is there any extra expense to the people of this Government? Is there any extra expense to the House? Is there any extra annoyance to anyone? Does it not bring it right down again to the fact that we want an opportunity to be heard? I can make no other appeal and no other statement to this committee. No argument against it can be made that can be considered worthy of your attention for a moment, as I believe, when the people simply ask at the hands of their representatives an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not understand that there is any complaint at all on the part of the ladies as to being heard. All who have appeared before the committee this morning have expressed their appreciation, or have expressed themselves as having had hearings before the Judiciary Committee. What they complain about is that the Judiciary Committee has not acted. We may as well be frank and candid about this matter. Is it not true that if this committee is created, or is provided, that it will be expected and will be insistently demanded that that committee be made up of persons whose predilection is known to be in favor of the report of a constitutional amendment?

Mr. RAKER. If the gentleman will permit me to answer both questions, with the highest regard for the Judiciary Committee always and of its membership, I want to say that it has been my observation for three years that they invite the ladies to present their matter before the committee; they say, "Come in, ladies, all of you, and we will take your statements; we will give you half a day or a day; we will hear one side's statement and we will hear the other side's statement." That hearing is all written out nicely and printed, and the ladies may get it and send it over the country, but there has not been one opportunity where they could go into an investigation and determine these facts like we do on any other matter. After that is done, Mr. Congressman, that report is quietly and gently and delicately and discriminately buried in the files of the Committee on the Judiciary. [Laughter.] I do not say this with any disrespect at all for the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, that is true—everybody knows that. [Laughter.] That is not imparting very much information. It has been done for years, and that, if I understand it, is the real basis of complaint; but the question which I was asking was in view of the statements you have made that it was merely about hearings. We may as well be frank and face this matter squarely. It is expected, is it not, that if this committee is created it will be demanded that there be placed upon the committee—that its membership be made up of Members of the House that are known to have a predilection in favor of this cause?

Mr. RAKER. My position on that is this, and I will answer it from my own point of view. I have always felt that all I could ask was that a fair, right-minded man should be upon the bench to decide any matter I might present to him. I would like to know that he stood on both feet squarely and ready to hear both sides, and, so far as I am individually concerned, if the membership of a committee

like this were appointed from men who have no prejudices, no bounden prejudices against the cause, it would be perfectly satisfactory to me. But undoubtedly those who stand for the right for women to vote would say: "Gentlemen, we want something in addition to what we have had in the past in the way of a hearing. We want the evidence presented; we want the facts presented, and after those have been presented we want this committee to sit down, go over this matter upon its legal features; upon its features as to whether the facts warrant and justify it, and we want their judgment as reasonable, honest, competent men, as there would be and could be no other from the membership of the House, and in that event they should either vote for it or vote against it."

MR. LENROOT. I will say that I have just received a message to go before the House.

MR. RAKER. I want to say this to you before you leave, because I know you are one of the fairest-minded men in the House. You believe what is right. That is my judgment, and I say it publicly, as I would say it privately; you believe in giving every man a fair hearing. Now, if a committee of 21 is appointed, and 20 of that committee voted against reporting the bill and 1 member of that committee voted in favor of that bill, that 1 member is entitled to take that bill upon the floor of the House and have the judgment of the House passed upon that amendment, and not bury it in the files forever. That is the proposition. I do not want to take up the time of you gentlemen as to the question of what the committee will do.

I should hate to think, Mr. Chairman, upon the mere open statement that if I were appointed upon any committee, without a hearing, without the facts, without a reason, that I would just simply, blindly report either for or against a measure. I am not going to believe that of any Member of the House of Representatives. I have not judged them in that way. But the trouble of it is that when we find in our locality and in our State a feeling that is rather against us, you know we are likely to be a little moral coward because we do not want to buck against that public sentiment in our community, and we stand back; we do not go on record. One of the best things that ever happened to manhood to bring it up and to bring about right and proper laws, is that they may have an opportunity to be presented before the House of Representatives, and that every man is compelled to vote aye or no. He may not dodge, he may not duck, he may not pair, he may not be away on some official business, or something of that sort to avoid giving his sentiment, but I want to see his name on the record, aye for the bill or no against it, so that I may know where I can place him. And that is where we get results. In this cause, I would feel, as one of the supporters of this resolution, absolutely satisfied if I could not get anything else, if this committee would report in favor of and the Speaker appoint a committee, and that committee, after hearing the cause fully and clearly, would report in favor of a constitutional amendment, I would say then the people will have an opportunity to be heard. One man could have the courage of his convictions to present it, and if they were all against it, then that would end it for a while.

MR. POW. Any man in the House now could have it voted on any suspension Monday.

Mr. RAKER. May I answer that?

Mr. Pou. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. We are so constituted, lots of us, and I guess I am just like the rest of them, I would say: "Here, what are you trying to pull off on me? What is this stunt you have?"

Mr. Pou. That is right; of course you need committee action.

Mr. RAKER. That is the position. I want to be fair, fair with my colleagues. I want every cause, if worthy of consideration, to have a chance to be heard, and we ask that you give us a committee. I can not say any more if I should talk an hour. Just that one sentence—give us a committee. We are entitled to it. Give these people an opportunity to be heard, and I want to say to this committee, that you will not do a better act while you are members of this committee.

Mr. GARRETT. If this special committee were created, you would not ask or expect that it exist or be continued either by those known to be in favor of the proposition or those against it?

Mr. RAKER. Absolutely, no; that is my position on the matter, and I want everybody to understand it.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course the House would select the committee. Nobody knows how its Members would vote until afterwards. It would be selected just like any other committee.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; and I should dislike to have a man put on the committee who would say: "I will vote against it if you put me on." He would not belong there, Judge.

Dr. SHAW. The gentleman has answered in behalf of himself in regard to the character of the committee to be appointed, and I want to say, in behalf of our association, that we would not assume to dictate the character of the committee, but we would hope that the committee would be an open-minded committee, and we are very sure that if it should be an open-minded committee it would be very speedily and unanimously in favor of our amendment. Then, one other thing: We are quite sure that even if the committee were composed entirely of people opposed to us, that Congressmen change, and we would not have to come up here for 20 years, because State after State is securing the suffrage, and we would be assured of a favorable committee within 10 years.

We wish to ask an extension of time, Mr. Chairman, because you took up about 15 minutes of the time allotted to us on committee matters.

The CHAIRMAN. About how much more time do you wish?

Dr. SHAW. We have only two other speakers.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think you can finish in 30 minutes?

Dr. SHAW. We will try to do so.

I wish to introduce to the committee Mrs. Mary Beard, of New York. Mrs. Beard's husband is one of the leading professors in Columbia University, and she is representing her husband as well as herself.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MARY BEARD, OF NEW YORK CITY.

Mrs. BEARD. Gentlemen of the committee, I always represent my husband when I speak on suffrage. Just as some of the men of 1776 claimed to believe that they could not maintain their rights in their

integrity or discharge their full duties as citizens while sovereignty lay absolutely in the crown of Great Britain, so we women to-day declare that the only way in which the masses of women can be sure of performing their duties to the race properly is by the possession of the same political power that you possess, in order that they may use it in the interests of women and children, as you have used yours in the interest of men and business. Like President Wilson, we want to be our own masters and enjoy the new freedom. We know our duties, and we know these social and economic conditions under which they must be performed. We know our duties, and we will perform them. That is enough to say about our responsibilities. We will leave that to the opposition to-morrow. We have come to-day to talk to you about your duties, and I trust you will see nothing discourteous in the shifting of the attention from us to you. We are actuated in this change of attitude not by a spirit of vindictiveness, but purely by the spirit of fair play. We have listened for untold generations to homilies on our duties. You gentlemen can afford to listen for an hour more to discussions about yours.

Your first responsibility, which I ask you to consider, is that to your party—to the Democratic Party—for it is our task to convince the majority of this committee to-day rather than the Republican minority. You are loyal members of the Democratic Party, and you want to maintain that party in power. I intend to show you that you can not maintain it in power unless you espouse votes for women as a party measure.

You may ask, "Why may we not do that without taking such a step?" My reply is: First, because the election returns for President Wilson in 1912 revealed the fact that you are in power in Washington with so flimsy a majority that if at the very next presidential election the votes of but one-eighth of the women in the suffrage States are changed from your support, a party that stands for equal suffrage will supplant you in the Nation. The Progressive Party stood second in the race in 1912, and may or may not prove as strong a factor again; but the rehabilitation of the Republican Party will surely draw from the strength given you by voters who gave you their ballots as a protest against Theodore Roosevelt. Furthermore, you will have to count on the possibility of the growth of the Progressive Party. There is also the rising Socialist vote, and the Socialist Party believes in woman suffrage. Socialists are far more likely to draw from your ranks than you are to drain theirs. The second reason why your duty to your party requires you to support the suffrage cause is revealed by a study of the electoral vote of the country. That study is proving intensely interesting to the American women and to all true Democrats.

The facts I have stated show that women voters have been given a shadow rather than the substance of political power by men who meant to play fair. In legislative parlance, we may say that nationally our enfranchised women have been presented with a "gold brick." As an illustration, let us look into certain figures. Let us compare the weight of the individual voter in the suffrage States with the weight of the voter in the Southern States, which are the only dependable bulwark of the Democratic Party. The total vote for President in 1912 in California was 663,065; in Mississippi, 64,319.

Mississippi cast about one-tenth the number of votes cast by California, yet Mississippi has 10 electoral votes while California has only 13. The total vote in Oregon for President in 1912—another suffrage State—was 137,040; in Florida the vote was 50,047, yet Florida has 6 electoral votes while Oregon has only 5.

The total vote of Washington in 1912, was 317,925; and of Virginia, 136,976; yet Virginia has 12 electoral votes, and Washington only 7. The total of votes in the five States—Arizona, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Kansas—in 1912 was 647,551. These States have an electoral vote of 24. The total number of votes of the States of South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, and Florida at the same election was 662,926, about the same number as cast by the States of Arizona, Utah, etc., yet they have 63 electoral votes as against only 24 electoral votes of the Western States I have named. But you say that electoral votes are based on population. So they are; but the South has that unduly large electoral vote illegally. You know what constitutes that illegality. The men of the East also have an undue electoral vote as compared with the people of the suffrage States; but they hold it unethically. Women are disfranchised there, and they are trying to make good that discrepancy by working to enfranchise the women. That is one reason why they are becoming suffrage campaign States.

A little mathematical calculation will readily show that 1 voter in one section of the country counts for as much as some 25 voters in other sections. Knowing this fact, the Democratic Party reposes in a tranquil assurance of power which is only apparent to the most superficial observer. The same calculations will show that when the western women got the right to vote for President and Representatives, they did not get the right to have that vote counted at its full value. These women are not going to be content with government by a party which regards their sex as mental and moral incompetents. In face of this situation what has the Democratic Party to say about the sincerity of its belief in majority rule? If you argue that you do believe in the people in spite of all, we ask in what people?

Whatever your answer as members of the Democratic Party may be, the fact remains that your strength lies in some 13 States, where your men, who can, will not vote. Those 13 States, however, which are the seat of your power, do not represent enough strength to maintain you in the White House and in Congress. Unless you can win Northern support again your chances at the next election are hopeless. Now, there is not one suffrage State or one suffrage campaign State of which you are at all certain. That counts out 20 States as opposed to your sure 13 States. Nor are you sure of Ohio, Wisconsin, or Michigan, which have been suffrage campaign States and which are keeping up the agitation for the enfranchisement of women. That makes 23 States in which woman suffrage is the liveliest issue of the day as opposed to your 13 Democratic strongholds. Therefore, the Democratic Party is confronted with this situation: That is, a North and West and East deeply and persistently interested in suffrage, but not really committed to your party; a South committed to you, but not equally aroused on the suffrage question. The South is not able to maintain your national supremacy in spite of its great electoral

advantages. Your only hope, therefore, for the next election is to espouse a cause that is popular in all the other sections of the country. The cause of suffrage is the obvious one for you to seize upon, even in desperation, and as a matter purely of political expediency, if you can not accept it from higher motives.

It is not enough, however, for you to accept suffrage in 1916. You will have to make known then your previous achievements as a test of competency to remain in office as the choice of the people of the whole Nation. If in the meantime, therefore, you have worked for the Federal amendment to enfranchise women, you might justly go before the people in 1916 as a Democratic Party prepared to defend the proposition that this should become what it has pretended to be—a Government of the people, by the people, for the people. So much for your duty to the political party with which you are affiliated.

Your second duty, as I see it, is to the House of which you are Members. Now, the prestige of that House in the popular esteem is seriously endangered. On more than one occasion recently public confidence in the superior representative feature of your chamber has been disturbed by your failure to act with the Senate in the interest of the masses. As we look to the immediate future, we observe a new type of Senator entering the portals of the Capitol, one chosen by a wider constituency than any of your Members represent; a man forced to win his election by the direct approval of large groups of people. The Senator who now comes to Washington has had to stump his State. He has had to stand for popular measures and obtain the confidence of very many classes in his State. The interests can not make him their spokesman hereafter as easily as they have done in the past. He has become the voter's man. In that respect you and he are not unlike, but he now represents more voters than you, and we may therefore reasonably expect the voters to regard him as the broader type of representative unless you realize the impending rivalry for the confidence of the people. If, instead of becoming the provincial representatives, you awake in time to feel the pulse of public opinion, too, we may indeed look forward to a Democratic régime which will surpass any which our Nation has ever experienced. The test is before you, and nothing will prove to the country your recognition of your true position as representatives of the voters as conclusively as your attitude toward women and the suffrage. The Senate has appointed its committee to look after this matter. Will you do as much? The approval of the people is no idle dream. In discussing this matter recently a Senator said:

Mr. President, why was it that Andrew Johnson had no influence with Congress and that Theodore Roosevelt had infinite influence with Congress? It is because one of them had not the confidence of the people and the other one had the entire confidence of the people. It is one of the most beautiful as well as one of the most beneficent workings of our popular form of government that any branch of it that at any particular period best represents the people has the confidence of the people.

I have called your attention to the relation between the suffrage issue and the future of the Democratic Party, and the status of the House of Representatives in the popular esteem. There remains one more important consideration: Your responsibility as individual Democrats, believing in majority rule, government by consent of the governed, by the will of the people at the polls. Obligation to your

own sincerity implies some self-analysis. You must see your rightful place in the present political situation. Now, this, your committee, is composed of 13 men. Seven men constitute the deciding vote on our appeal for the establishment of the woman-suffrage committee. These seven belong to the majority, the Democratic Party. One of those seven Democrats comes from a suffrage State, Illinois, where women now have some share in directing the future of the party, and another member comes from a suffrage campaign State, New York, where the Democracy of the State has declared itself in favor of submitting this question to the voters. He will scarcely feel that the national Democratic Party can ignore so important a declaration of the New York State section of his party. I shall, therefore, limit my examination to five gentlemen whose point of view will, in all probability, decide the women's destiny in the House of Representatives, at least for the moment. These five gentlemen all represent one section of the country, and my analysis of them is made in the hope that they will secure a national point of view and help us obliterate sectional feeling.

Who are you, gentlemen, who hesitate to promote, if you do not actually obstruct, our progress with this amendment? In looking over various public records I find that the honored chairman of this committee holds his strategic position as a result of the will expressed at the polls of 7,623 men. Opposite his name should be written: "No opposition." Another of the 5 men comes here through the vote of 13,906 men. Another is sent by the very small group of 6,474 men, and the remaining 2 of the 5 gentlemen represent, respectively, 18,000 and 16,000 men. The total vote behind all 5 of these gentlemen is 63,570. These 63,570 voters, therefore, have the decision of this momentous question. Are they entitled to speak for the Nation? We find that 1 man from the House of Representatives, from the State of Colorado, represents as many votes as all the 5 men who thus control our destiny. Another man from the same State represents nearly as many votes, having been elected by 54,504 Democratic men and women. Sixty-three thousand five hundred and seventy voters have the power of decision as to whether our right to be free in this country shall be discussed honestly in the House of Representatives. They send 5 men to express their will. One hundred and seventeen thousand five hundred and four voters believe in woman suffrage. They send 2 men to express their will. These 5 men happen to be a majority of this Committee on Rules; the 2 men sent by the 117,570 voters have no say at all, unless the 5 grant them the privilege. Is this democracy? Is this satisfactory congressional procedure?

If you are content with this situation from the standpoint that women only double the vote, and therefore do not really count, let us try some other figures on your form of democratic government. Remember, first, the 63,570 men who have the power of decision over our claim to-day. Then place against them such votes as that for Congressman Stone, of Illinois, for instance, who was sent by the votes of 20,956; Hobson, of Alabama, with his 10,065 votes; Bailey, of Pennsylvania, with 13,626; and Stevens, of New Hampshire, with 21,794 votes, and the vote of all other suffrage friends from new suffrage States. More votes were cast in Ohio for suffrage,

where suffrage did not carry, than were cast in several Southern States for President Wilson. The same thing can be said of Wisconsin and Michigan. The point of it all is this, that the Committee on Rules itself has undergone changes throughout the history of the House.

You know the fight that you Democratic men put up against the combination by the Committee on Rules under the leadership of Speaker Cannon, and you yourselves led that fight against the domination of the Committee on Rules over the House. You are in this same position to-day of political power. Can you consistently, then, oppose now the things for which you fought so bitterly a short time ago? I have here a list of the committees you appointed. This is called "Congressional committees." We know the committees which you have appointed all through your history—how rapidly you have done it when the changed economic conditions demanded it. I have also here your fight on Speaker Cannon because of his domination of the Committee on Rules, because the Rules Committee was dominating the House. I have also here the report of the Committee on the Judiciary for the special session, showing what work it did, what action it took, how many sittings it held, and all that sort of thing, which proves conclusively that the committee has not time for the consideration of this thing. Furthermore, granting that we could get one of our suffrage men in the House, and others voting with him, to call for a report of the Committee on the Judiciary, you know you value far less a vote that has been dragged out that way, and you know the difficulties in going behind the committee action in that way. I have lobbied in the New York Assembly, and I know those conditions myself as well as all other women who have lobbied.

Gentlemen, we come not as suppliants. We make our request knowing that we have behind us an aggressive section of the Democratic Party; that the party that stood second in 1912 is with us; that we have strong political friends all up and down the country; that we have free women, who propose to work for the unfree.

Gentleman, in the face of all this, we stand pat. It is your move.

Dr. SHAW. The lady who will now represent our association before your committee is Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, the president of the International Women's Suffrage Association, which organization represents the organized womanhood of 28 nations. There are only two nations in the world, which can extend the right of suffrage to women, which have not an organized group of women under the International Suffrage Association.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT.

Mrs. CATT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, inasmuch as the United States Constitution apportioned the Members of Congress to the population of the various States, it follows that the women are equally the constituents of every Member of this Congress. Inasmuch as women ask very little, it seems to me that every courtesy ought to be extended to them on that account, and the thing that we ask is, after all, something that is in accord with the most fundamental claims of our Government, the one which has always been our special American hobby—free speech; the free hearing of

every kind of claim. There was once a great struggle in this Congress over the right of petition, and I believe it was considered to have been at that time forever established as the right of the most insignificant individual in this country to come to his particular Member of Congress and to present to him in full any grievance which he might wish to have righted. Now, our peculiar distress is that we are not entitled to the right to present our grievances in accordance with these American ideas and fundamental principles.

A few weeks ago there was a dispatch sent out from this city of Washington, in which the statement was made that the Judiciary Committee for the next year was going to be more overworked than it had ever been before. It was accompanied by a letter which was made public from the President to Mr. Clayton, in which he begged of him to continue as chairman of that committee and to withdraw from his candidacy for the Senate from Alabama, because this committee was going to do more work than the committee had ever been called upon to do before. He called attention to the fact that the Ways and Means Committee had been obliged to work day and night, sometimes spending the whole night, I believe, upon their particular business, and he warned Mr. Clayton that this might be the expectation of the Judiciary Committee in this coming Congress. In the times past, when the Judiciary Committee only worked during the day time, we have not been able to get the attention which we believe our cause demands, and we think that with this additional work it is quite impossible to expect more attention than we have had in the past.

After the suggestion was offered by your committee, Mr. Chairman, that possibly this business might go before the Elections Committee, two or three of the ladies went out from the room and have interviewed someone, I do not know who, or whether they saw the right person, but three different ones have brought back the report, the last one of which I hold here, that the President's plan for presidential primary legislation will make the Elections Committee a very busy one this coming session, and, as it is likely to be as busy as the Committee on the Judiciary, it is not a very feasible committee to take over this business. They have also happened to mention that there are a good many committees that seem to have to do with minor causes.

It is my understanding that committees are appointed with special relations to their ability to treat of the subjects which come before them. Among these committees of which I had never heard before, I find one upon the disposition of useless executive papers. It strikes me that that might be a suitable committee to take over this subject, provided it is appointed with special view to its ability to treat of useless executive papers, because the particular thing we want is to get rid of one useless adjective in the United States Constitution. However, when this business goes before a committee already appointed, that committee is presumably appointed for the special purposes for which the committee existed at the time of its appointment. A new committee would presumably be appointed with reference to the business it was to conduct.

The question was asked if we expected that all members of the committee would be favorable to our cause. Our committee would

naturally be appointed by the same processes that other committees are appointed. Doubtless the committee would be selected with reference to the political complexion of the House as in other cases. We could not expect that all of the members of such a committee would be favorable, but we certainly should expect that we would have members on that committee who would come from States where women vote.

I recall with great distinctness that in some years past a very eminent gentleman—I will say, for the comfort of this committee, that he was a Senator, not a Member of the House—this very distinguished gentleman, who was chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee, said, after a hearing of the women upon this question, he said this to a fellow Senator, who gave the words verbatim to the rest of us—that he did not know any man or any individual who could find an answer to the arguments which the women had presented, and that they were absolutely beyond reply, but, said he, “I would rather see my wife dead in her coffin than going down to the polls to vote.” Now, if our committee to be is composed of men who are governed by superstition rather than by reason, we should not fare any better than we have in the past. We want a committee that is up to date, as sufficiently up to date as the House of Representatives ought to be. I am informed also, although I do not know for myself that this is true, because it is so far back in ancient history that I do not profess to know, but I understand that the last time the question of woman’s suffrage was discussed in this House was in 1866. There was a discussion at the time Wyoming was admitted to statehood, but with that exception there has been nothing since 1866.

We pride ourselves in this country upon democracy; we pride ourselves upon giving the people a chance, as I have already said, to right their grievances. Yet, while the Judiciary Committee have declined to report upon our bill and thus to bring it before the House, where it may be discussed, the question of woman suffrage has been discussed in the imperial parliaments of 12 European countries in the last parliamentary term; that is, of 1912 and 1913. I give you the list, which is as follows: Great Britain, Iceland, Denmark, Norway—which discussed it with such good effect that it will never need to discuss it again, having enfranchised women—France, which two years before had appointed one of its members chairman of a committee to make an investigation into the merits or demerits of woman suffrage throughout the world, and upon the report of that committee the question was again discussed. As a result of it several of the councils of the cities of France, including that of Paris, have recently passed resolutions calling upon the Parliament to take action and give the vote to women. Sweden also discussed it and two years ago appointed a committee to conduct an investigation, as France did. The chairman of that committee was notably hostile to this question, and yet despite that fact his report contained so much evidence to the good that the King of Sweden recommended woman suffrage in his message, and it was only defeated by the upper house. It was even discussed, gentlemen, in the Duma of Russia upon three distinct different occasions this last winter. It was discussed in Switzerland upon a bill extending the vote to the State church, which was passed. It was discussed in Belgium, at which time the Government of Belgium answered the appeal of

the Socialists, who had gone upon a national strike, that if they compelled the Government to give universal suffrage to men they would retaliate and give universal suffrage to women. It was discussed in Holland in connection with the proposal for a constitutional commission. It was discussed in Portugal, and it was discussed in Italy. These are all imperial parliaments.

The list is so much shorter of the European countries, where it was not discussed, that I will give it. It was not discussed in the Imperial Parliament of Austria; although it was discussed in what we call the State Parliament of Bohemia, where the suffrage was again ratified by the legislature, having been in existence ever since 1861, even before the days of Wyoming. It was discussed in Waidhofen, in South Austria, and the vote was made direct and compulsory for women property owners in that Province. It was not discussed in the German Imperial Reichstag, but was in some of the local diets, notably Bavaria. It was not discussed in Spain, although a bill was introduced. In the countries in southeastern Europe, which have been involved in war, at which time we do not expect discussion on subjects such as this, it was not discussed; that is, in Greece, Roumania, or Servia; but in Servia a case came before the courts in which a woman demanded the ancient right of the vote which had been in the possession of the women ever since the days of feudalism. It was not discussed in Turkey. There are 8 European countries which did not discuss this question in the last term of parliament and 12 which did. I think we may excuse Austria and Germany, inasmuch as it was discussed in some of their local diets, and we may excuse the war countries, because they were otherwise engaged. And so it seems to remain that the United States Congress and the Parliament of Turkey are the only ones who, in this day, refuse to discuss this question.

Mr. HARDWICK. It seems to me that I have an indistinct recollection of having heard some discussion of it in the Congress. It seems to me I heard Mr. Heflin, of Alabama, discuss the matter briefly.

Mrs. CATT. Possibly that is true, but I do not think it was discussed upon the merits of a bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. And I think there has been some discussion of it in the Senate.

Mrs. CATT. Yes; there has been a bill, but the bill has not been discussed, has it?

Mr. HARDWICK. The subject matter has been discussed.

Mrs. CATT. But in these other cases of which I speak it was not discussed as merely a topic for casual discussion. It was discussed on the merits of the bills in every single case, except Holland, when it was in relation to the calling of a constitutional convention.

Mr. HARDWICK. If you will pardon me for just a moment, the reason why that is true in all these countries is not true in this country, because here our States by local laws reach these matters, while there the imperial parliaments of most of those countries, except Austria-Hungary, do their own vote regulating. Is not that the difference?

Mrs. CATT. Of course there is that difference, Mr. Congressman. But I wish to add my opinion to that which Miss Addams presented here, that while we have given the right to the States to extend the vote, that it is the most outrageously unfair process through which any class of unenfranchised citizens of any land have ever been called

upon to secure their enfranchisement, and that is the reason why we come to Congress. We believe it has the right to give the vote to us, and that it is the duty of Congress to do so, because Congress, in its naturalization laws, has given citizenship to men, while the States in collaboration with them, I may say, have given the vote to those naturalized citizens, a fact which virtually makes the United States enfranchise the men who come from other countries.

It is a technical difference only, Mr. Chairman, but I stand here to say that to-day the overwhelming majority of the men of this country have not secured their suffrage by any vote at the polls of the States in which they possess the vote to-day. If there are such men, I ask where are they? The only class that I have ever been able to find in our history so enfranchised are the working men in the original 13 colonies, and they were given the vote by that process long ago when the population was exceeding small. There are more men to-day voting on the basis of their citizenship under naturalization than for any other reason whatsoever, and yet our State constitutions compel us to go to those men and ask our vote at their hands. These men who have condescended to live here five years only may then say whether the women, who have been born and bred here and educated in our schools, shall have the vote. It happens that in Europe, with the exception of Switzerland, the vote may be given by parliamentary enactment, and it is given by an easier process than we can hope for here. We believe we have the right to bring our question to Congress, and that is why we ask for our committee.

Mr. HARDWICK. You are making pretty good progress now by States, are you not?

Mrs. CATT. We are making good progress by States, but if you were not a voter, I will ask you what you think your chances would be if you were to try to present your cause, your man's cause, with all its prestige in this country—your man's cause to all these newly enfranchised men under naturalization who do not even know our language or how to read a newspaper.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, that would be pretty bad, but you have made the most progress in the States where there is the largest percentage of foreign population, have you not?

(Calls of "no" from the audience.)

Mr. HARDWICK. I stand corrected then. I thought that was the case.

Mrs. CATT. My time is up.

The CHAIRMAN. We will give you a little more time.

Mrs. CATT. I will say in conclusion, if I may, that we are going to stand by our right to get the vote by as easy a process as it was given to the negro, and while there are gentlemen in the South who do not think that that was done in a very constitutional way—and I entirely agree with them—nevertheless it has stood the test of some 40 years, and it is a part of the Constitution. If this country could do that for the black man it can do it for us. If the Constitution or the National Government has no power to extend the vote to women; if the majority of this Congress thinks it has no such power, then I ask this Congress to call a national constitutional convention and let us have a constitution which can do justice to the women of this country.

Dr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we thank you for the courtesy of the hearing, and for the extension of

time which has been given us, and for the courteous manner in which you have listened to our arguments. I wish to say in concluding, Mr. Chairman, that while some of the statements have been questioned, and that while one of the members of your committee stated that the National Constitution only granted citizenship to certain men, but did not grant with that citizenship the right to vote, the Supreme Court of the United States has decided otherwise, and, in a case it decided in Louisiana it was stated in the decision of the Supreme Court that since the United States Congress granted citizenship to the negro, it granted him the right to vote in every State in the Union, and that was the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. HARDWICK. I should not like for that statement to go out. The position of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Louisiana case was simply this: That since the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, no State had the right to deny the right to vote on account of a man's color or previous condition of servitude, not that it granted anyone the right to vote.

Dr. SHAW. The decision from which I quoted was taken from a decision of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; I am very familiar with the case. I have practiced law all my life, and I am familiar with that case.

Dr. SHAW. We have read the decision and that is the statement in the decision. Now, if the Congress has the power to decree that as a citizen of the United States the negro, or any other man, shall not be deprived of the right to vote by States, then what we ask is that Congress shall decree, since it has decreed women to be citizens of the United States, that no State shall deny women citizens the right to vote on account of sex any more than it did negroes on account of color.

Mr. HARDWICK. In order to secure that all you have to do is to add to the fifteenth amendment the word "sex," but then it would take a constitutional amendment to do that.

Dr. SHAW. It takes a constitutional amendment to do it, and what we are asking is such an amendment to our National Constitution which shall forbid the States to deprive the women citizens of the right which it grants to every man born in the United States, or to every man imported from any country under the light of the sun. There is no nation, Mr. Chairman, which has subjected its women to the humiliating position which is occupied by the women of this Nation to-day. No nation of the world ever subjected its women to the votes of the classes of people who are to-day controlling the destinies of womanhood in the United States. There is no race, no color, no clime, no condition which does not bring its citizens to this country, and these citizens are made the governing force which determines the destinies of women in the United States; and I claim that, while women are disfranchised in Germany, yet German women are governed by German men; in France, French women are governed by French men. In all the nations of Europe where women are disfranchised, they are disfranchised by the men of their own nation, but in this United States the women are disfranchised by every kind of men under the light of the sun. Men of every color, every shade, every complexion, every race, have the power to go to the polls and

vote that American-born women may not be entitled to have a voice in their own Government. And not only that, Mr. Chairman, but a native-born citizen of these United States, a woman born here, as was a niece of mine, whose father fought in the war for the country, whose grandfather fought in the war for the country—that niece of mine happened to be foolish enough to marry an Englishman, and from that moment she ceased to be a citizen of the United States. It is a shame for any government to make it possible for a woman born and reared in the country to cease to be a citizen unless she has committed some crime against the Government; and if marriage is considered a crime I will grant you that many of our women have committed that crime, but we are told that it is the honorable destiny of the women of our country. Therefore, gentlemen, we claim that it is the business of the United States Government to protect women citizens as it protects men citizens, and we ask for this committee because we believe that if our subject can be brought before Congress and Congress is permitted to speak upon it and discuss it freely, as it does other questions, and it can be carried to the States, it will be decided by the legislatures of the States who believe in justice and fair play in favor of the enfranchisement of women.

Mr. Chairman, you asked us in regard to the committee. I hesitated, because I disliked to take the responsibility of deciding as I wished to first have the opinion of my colleagues and officers. The opinion, however, is unanimous in favor of the appointment of a special committee, and especially is this true since we have learned what a large amount of work is to be given to the other committees. We also know that committees treat the subjects in which they are most deeply interested with the greatest consideration, and accord to those subjects their first attention. What we ask, therefore, gentlemen, is that a committee shall be appointed upon this subject of woman suffrage alone; that it may be the first, the imperative, duty of this committee to consider it upon its merits. We ask for a special committee corresponding with the like committee in the Senate.

We ask also that you shall permit the publication of our hearings, and that we shall have as large an edition as it is possible for the committee to give us. And you have also granted us, Mr. Chairman, that we shall have the opportunity for a rebuttal, and we ask that time shall be given for that.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank the members of your committee.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned to meet the next day, Thursday, December 4, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 4, 1913.

The committee assembled at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. Robert L. Henry (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The committee has assembled to hear those who wish to appear against the pending resolution for creating a committee on woman suffrage, and Mrs. Dodge will have charge of the hearings for her side of the question to-day. Mrs. Dodge, we will be pleased to hear you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE, OF NEW YORK CITY.

Mrs. DODGE. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, we appear before you to-day to protest against the formation of a committee on woman suffrage. It has been intimated to us that the committee would welcome any evidence which goes to show that there is not a popular demand which would warrant the appointment of a special committee, an appointment which would give encouragement to the suffrage propaganda. It is unnecessary to deal with the question of constitutional precedent, but the arguments which will be submitted will seek to show that woman suffrage is inexpedient, and, because it is inexpedient, the appointment of a committee on woman suffrage is not warranted. The suffragists have appeared before Congress since 1874 and have had some 34 hearings. Thirteen years ago we made the first protest of the organized women against woman suffrage. With a great effort we persuaded nine women to appear, all of whom are now alive, and vigorous antisuffragists, and seven of whom are present at this hearing. In contrast to these 9 pioneers of 13 years ago, coming from but two small organizations, we to-day, on the occasion of our fourth hearing against woman suffrage, represent 16 State organizations and nearly 90,000 organized women, all over voting age. This is the more remarkable, I think, because these are the type of women who naturally are reluctant to organize.

I have the pleasure of introducing, as our first speaker, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, president of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

STATEMENT OF MISS ALICE HILL CHITTENDEN, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

MISS CHITTENDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, we appear before your honorable committee this morning to ask you not to recommend the appointment of an equal suffrage committee of the House of Representatives, and we base our opposition to the formation of such a committee on the ground that the question of suffrage does not come within the jurisdiction of the National Congress. The Federal Constitution leaves the regulation of the suffrage to the States themselves and this is a very wise provision, since each State has its own peculiar problems and conditions to meet. The great Empire State, which I represent, has the acute problem of a large alien population, a problem that is scarcely known in some of our far western States. There are, for instance, 2,257,000 females over 21 years old in New York State. Of these only about 900,000 are white women of native parentage, while over a million are foreign born. Over 700,000 are white of foreign or mixed parentage, and about 49,000 are negroes. That, gentlemen, is the problem that confronts the voters of New York State, the question of adding this vast number of alien votes to our present electorate of nearly 3,000,000, and we claim that it is not a question to be determined for New York State by the legislatures of 36 other States, which might possibly vote for a Federal constitutional amendment to extend the suffrage to all the women

in all the States. It is obvious, however, that at a meeting of this kind the discussion can not be confined to this one point, and therefore we take the opportunity, as Mrs. Dodge has said, of presenting to you some of the fundamental objections to this proposition of extending the suffrage to women.

Generally speaking, the whole question of vesting women with political responsibility is erroneously associated in the minds of many with the other changes which have taken place in woman's position during the past half century. But there is a vast difference between the civil rights which women have obtained during this period and political responsibility which it is now proposed to impose upon all the women of this country. Under the old common law, which we inherited from England, women suffered from many legal disabilities, but these have been removed by legislation until in many of the States women's legal privileges are better than those enjoyed by men. The movement for a higher education for women followed in very close sequence after the change in their legal status, and to-day women in this country have every opportunity open to them in every line that is open to men. The professions are open to women, and there is practically no industry which they may not enter, no occupation in which they may not engage. Now, it may be said that all these changes have been met by opposition, and that therefore there is nothing unique in the antisuffrage movement to-day. But there was never any concerted effort against the higher education of woman; there was never any organized effort to prevent her entering the professions or industries, because all of these changes have simply been an extension of woman's civil and personal rights. They have been, in fact, in the natural line of her development. But personal freedom has little or nothing whatever to do with sovereign authority. The extension of suffrage to women does not mean the extension of another right to the individual woman; it means the imposition of political responsibilities upon all women in addition to those they already have. There is, therefore, a distinct line of cleavage which we anti-suffragists recognize between what has been the natural development of the individual woman's personal rights and the question of the imposition of political responsibilities upon all women. The present position of woman has been obtained without the ballot. If it were known to-morrow that no woman would ever vote outside of the States where women already have the franchise, not a single activity in which they are now engaged would be lessened; they would not be excluded from any university or college or kept out of the professions or industries.

Those of us who appear before you to-day are not women who sit by the fireside with our knitting or spinning in the twilight of a past generation. We are not drones or parasites or shirks, as is sometimes said. We feel the great heart throbs of the world around us. We are conscious of the great problems of this age and generation which press upon us from all sides. Most of us are serving upon boards of philanthropy or social welfare which deal directly with these problems, and as we study into them we find that many of them are due to the relentlessness of the modern industrial and economic conditions which have forced so many women out of the home into the world of industry as man's competitor. Despite all

that is said of the glory of economic independence for women, every thoughtful person recognizes a woman's limitations when it comes to competing in the same lines of activity with men. This was distinctly recognized some years ago when the Supreme Court of the United States rendered its famous decision, declaring in the Oregon case that a law limiting the hours a woman might be legally employed was constitutional on the ground that as the mother of the race she had a right to such protection, which the man working by her side did not possess. Women may chafe and fret under these limitations. They may declare that they are forced to live under man-made laws which hamper their freedom and independence, but it is the God-made law which is their real grievance, and we might as well try to stop the stars in their course as to change the immutable physiological laws of nature.

There has recently been held in the city of Washington a conservation congress. We are told that we must conserve our waterways, our forests, our mines, in order that this generation as well as the generations to follow may share in the benefits to be derived from those resources. We are told that we must conserve the life of the workingman by safeguarding him at his work. We are told that we must safeguard the life of the children by supplying them with pure milk. Conservation is the watchword of the hour, and we anti-suffragists are true conservationists. We seek to conserve woman's present valuable position in the community as a nonpartisan citizen. Give her the ballot and she will of necessity ally herself with one party or the other, and thus become but another spoke in the wheel of our political machinery. We seek to conserve the American home and family life; not the home of our forefathers, where the thrifty housewife did the spinning and weaving and engaged in countless other occupations, but the home where woman is still the "very pulse of the machine"; the home where the weary and lonely ones in the world may come for refreshment and comfort. We seek to conserve all that is noblest and best in true womanhood. We stand for an education and training which will develop woman so that she will be more and more man's companion and helpmeet, not his rival and competitor. Believing that the conservation of energies strengthens one's forces, while diffusion weakens them, we deplore the way in which woman's energies are being wasted and diffused in so many channels and activities to-day, and therefore we stand, gentlemen, for the conservation of woman's strength and forces that she may the better perform the great task that has been given her to do in the world.

Mrs. DODGE. Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me to say just a few words. If the applause continues during the morning and afternoon in this way we shall not be able to get through with our program, and I am going to ask the audience, as is the usual custom in hearings, to refrain from applause. If we please and interest you we shall take it for granted, but if we use up so many seconds we shall not get through our hearing. I am sorry, but I shall have to ask you not to applaud except at the conclusion of the speaker's remarks.

The next speaker whom I shall introduce is Mrs. Robert Garrett, president of the Maryland Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ROBERT GARRETT, PRESIDENT OF THE MARYLAND ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mrs. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, it is my privilege this morning to be the mouthpiece of several hundreds of people in the State of Maryland. I come to put before you Maryland's plea and Maryland's protest against any Federal enactment in regard to woman suffrage. We have had this agitation in Maryland for some 40 years, and it has been kept alive by a group of very active, very earnest, very zealous, and, to my mind, very mistaken women. It is headed by a woman who is not a Maryland woman, who does not get our more Southern point of view, who does not see the position of Maryland as we women and men of the State do. I feel, therefore, that she is hardly competent to put in a claim for Maryland men and Maryland women.

The argument of the suffragists with us is that it has been quite impossible and ever will be impossible for women to count for anything in the State until they have the ballot. That has been freely told and alluded to again and again. We are told that it is useless to be interested in the babies of the State so long as we have not the ballot. We are told that it avails nothing to have a tuberculosis union so long as we have not the ballot. We are told that the position of woman in industry can never be helped so long as we have not the ballot. All that sounds very plausible, and it has brought a number of women to believe that therefore women must have the ballot, but the vast majority of Maryland women and Maryland men do not heed this at all. We have been working in Maryland for years with astonishing results which you will find it hard to equal. We have a 10-hour law for women in Maryland; we have an excellent child-labor law for children in Maryland; we have reduced the death rate among infants 60 per cent in the last 25 years. All this, gentlemen of the committee, without the ballot. The men and women in Maryland have been working side by side and will continue to work side by side despite the claims of the suffragists, for we have been getting results. It has been my peculiar privilege to be thrown in contact with a number of social workers of Maryland. Their work has gone on daily unhampered and with great growth; and in connection with this antisuffragist movement I have talked with men and women—doctors, lawyers, saleswomen, stenographers, laborers, and people in every class and condition. The sentiment in Maryland is universally opposed to woman suffrage, and therefore as a Marylander I feel it would be not only dangerous but utterly unjust for the Federal Government to inflict upon Maryland woman suffrage, for which it has no desire and which the women of Maryland feel will distinctly hamper them. You know perfectly well in your political careers that if you are a Democrat, Republicans do not come to you; and if you are a Republican the Democrats do not come to you, because you are political antagonists. That is not true of us women. We all come to you whenever we want anything. We have no regard whether you are a Democrat, no regard whether you are a Republican, no regard whether you are a Progressive. It means enough to us that you are the men who can do something for us. We are all women and can be absolutely impartial. We have no ambition for position or aggrandizement or for the power that comes with

the ballot. We believe that it would be absolutely a hindrance, a block in our path, and, in behalf of Maryland, I come to you to protest against the enactment of a law for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution, for it is absolutely not wanted and it will work more injury to Maryland than anything that has happened to her in years.

Mrs. DODGE. The next speaker that I will introduce is Mrs. H. E. Talbott, president of the Ohio Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, and just at present she is the head of the women's relief work at Dayton, quite a responsible position.

STATEMENT OF MRS. H. E. TALBOTT, PRESIDENT OF THE OHIO ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mrs. TALBOTT. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, ladies, and gentlemen, I appreciate most keenly the opportunity to be heard here, because I think there is a spirit of fairness to us among the men of this country and a willingness to hear what we have to say.

In my opinion, there seems to be this great contention between the suffragists and the antisuffragists because of a very serious misunderstanding. It is because the suffragists believe that the vote will do great good that they are striving for it, and it is because we believe it will do no good whatever that we are striving against it. In their eagerness and desire for the betterment of conditions they are striking out for the vote, because they believe that will accomplish great good. Their slogan is, "Votes for women," and I am unwilling to believe this tremendous energy which they have and which they are expending is being expended entirely for votes for women. I believe that they consider that the vote means the accomplishment of great good. We, upon our part, believe that far greater good can be accomplished by the women of this great country without the vote. They have accomplished great good in the past, they are accomplishing great good in the present, and we believe that in the future they will accomplish still greater good.

I have the honor to represent the State of Ohio, and as an anti-suffragist I represent a tremendous majority in our State. When the referendum vote was taken the suffragists claimed 32,000, which was a little less than 3 per cent of the women of the State of Ohio. How many of these suffragists were of voting age I do not know. I know that in our part of the State we have one suffrage organization with several hundred members, which includes many men, and which also includes a small child 6 months of age, whose mother and grandmother both proudly declare is the youngest suffragist in the State of Ohio. I do not know of what value she is to their organization, but she may be of some value to us later on when she gets older and does not agree with her mother and grandmother.

Now, we ask by what right this 3 per cent of the women of Ohio demand suffrage for the tremendous majority of the women of our State against the earnest protest or indifference of the 97 per cent, and that 97 per cent in the main a body of good, strong, fine, home-loving women, who wish to attend to the duties of their homes and who do attend to them to the utmost of their powers. The avenues of usefulness are open to the women of the State of Ohio in every direction—schools, churches, industries, hospitals, and, as a matter of

fact, all civic matters. Recently we have been fortunate enough to have a legislature enact for us a bill which provides for the appointment of women in all public institutions where women and children are cared for. This was done without any votes for women. The men are only too glad to provide such legislation as is necessary and valuable for the women and children of our State. Rather an interesting feature is that of the personal equation which enters into the matter of legislation. Any woman, whether a resident of the State of Ohio or not, or whether of foreign birth or an American, may sit at her desk and may frame a measure, and if she is sufficiently fortunate to persuade some legislator to present that bill, and it is acted upon favorably by the legislature, it may become a law without the knowledge or consent of any voter in the State of Ohio. I do not think we need the vote very badly in the State of Ohio.

The women have been able for many years to do wonderful work. In short, for 20 years there has been a concerted effort among the men and women to get all charitable, educational, and civic institutions so far as possible out of politics. There has been a tremendous effort in that direction, and there has been great success. Now comes this wave of enthusiasm which seeks to put everything right back into politics. We protest. We object. It seems to me that it is a great pity that it should be necessary for busy women to come and make a protest against action being taken at the request of 3 per cent of the women of this country, or 5 or 10 or even 20 per cent. We busy women want to be allowed to pursue our duties and to do as we think best, to be entirely satisfied that all legislative enactment will be as it should be, that it will look after and safeguard the interests of the women and the children of our State. It seems to be a pity that we have to waste time to protest against having greater responsibilities thrust upon us. But women in my position, with children, feel that it is not this generation alone that would have these responsibilities so much as the next. I am here to protest against suffrage for women in my own behalf and in behalf of seven daughters who might have responsibilities thrust upon them. It is my duty to them to protect them, and to place them in that sphere of duty and activity where I think they can do the most good for themselves and for the country at large.

I am hoping to teach them that their great duty to the State lies within the construction department of the Government. I consider that the women of this vast country are responsible for the stuff of which the Government is made.

There are no men here who will not agree, who will not bow their heads in appreciation of the good their mothers have done for them. The mothers of this country should be responsible for the voters of this country, and if the voters of this generation are failing it is because the women of the last generation—God bless them—in many instances failed to bring up good citizens and the fine men and the true statesmen that they should have brought up. And they can not correct that mistake by any vote. The way to correct that mistake now is to begin with the children, with the boys, and bring them up to good citizenship, to true manliness, and to upright character, which shall enable them to take any position which shall come to them in the Government.

In Colorado there is great contention as to the success of suffrage. Supposing that 20 years ago each woman in the State of Colorado had made it her business to see that one man-child was properly educated—it may have been her son or nephew—she may have had no family, and it may have been through the school that her activity might have been developed, but if each woman in the State of Colorado had made herself responsible for the proper development of one man-child, the eyes of the world to-day would be upon the electorate of Colorado, and the women would have done it. There is no doubt of that. There would be no question as to the success of the women in Colorado. There is now a very great question.

Gentlemen of the committee, I plead for the mothers of the children of this country. There are many women who have no families; I wish they all had, but it seems to me that the unit of civilization must be looked after. That unit is the home, and nothing should be done to divert the women from their God-given duties to the home and to their children.

I thank you.

Mrs. DODGE. Mrs. Talbott forgot to mention one fact, and that is that Ohio turned down women suffrage by about 90,000 majority at the last election.

The next speaker, Mr. Chairman, will give you a few facts and figures. Miss Minnie Bronson, secretary of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

**STATEMENT OF MISS MINNIE BRONSON, GENERAL SECRETARY
OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.**

Miss BRONSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Rules Committee, we are here to-day, a band of women who belong to that class termed by our suffragist friends "working women." We are all working women. Some of us find it necessary to work for our livelihood, while others of us who are not so handicapped can work alone for the common good. To the former class I belong. I have been a self-supporting woman since I was 20 years of age, and in that time I have never received a dollar which I have not earned. I have, therefore, not only the fullest sympathy but a community of interest with the working girl no matter what interpretation the suffragist may place upon that term.

There has been so much said about the need of the ballot for women, both wage-earning women and property-owning women; there has been so much said of the enormous advantage to be gained by women through the ballot, so much about the admirable laws for women and children found in women-suffrage States which have been brought about by the ballot in the hands of women that the committee who have in charge our presentation to-day have asked me to take up a short review of such legislation and show what the net result has been in comparison with States where women have not exercised the elective franchise.

In making this comparison I do not wish to be understood as deprecating such legislation in woman-suffrage States. It is as good and no better than in many male-suffrage States. What I do expect

to show is that the votes of women have not brought about better conditions in those States than exist in male-suffrage States having practically identical conditions industrially and geographically.

When you hear a statement like this, "17 States have equal guardianship laws and 9 of them are suffrage States," as a suffragist said the other day, it should be borne in mind that in at least three States out of the nine no remedial legislation has been enacted since woman suffrage carried in those States, and whatever legislation rests upon their statute books to-day was placed there under male suffrage. That in at least one of the remaining six States both the child labor law and the woman's labor law were passed before women's suffrage obtained, so that any sweeping assertion which includes all these States loses both point and power. For example, Oregon carried woman suffrage in November, 1912, but her splendid child labor law—one of the best—was passed some years before. California's child-labor law was passed before woman suffrage carried in that State, and her famous eight-hour law for women passed nine months before woman suffrage carried and would have been on the statute books to-day if woman suffrage had been defeated. Yet suffragists claim that eight-hour law as a victory for suffrage for they say that the same legislature that passed the eight-hour law passed also the woman-suffrage bill. That legislature did not pass a woman-suffrage bill, they passed a bill submitting the question to a vote of the people, and I personally know 20 legislators who voted to submit the question of woman suffrage to a vote of the people, who not only voted against it at the polls but who worked against it as well; and here is a point I would like to emphasize. If this committee should recommend to Congress the appointment of a special committee to consider the question of woman suffrage, within 24 hours the word will be telegraphed to the remotest parts of the earth that the Congress of the United States and the Democratic Party had indorsed woman suffrage, and every man who votes in the affirmative will be hailed as an exponent of the cause.

In reference, however, to the laws for the protection of women and children who work, I challenge any suffragist to show that any progress has been made in any or all of the suffrage States that has not been made in male suffrage States of like industrial development. I assert without fear of successful contradiction that there is not a law for the protection of the young child who works on the statute books of any suffrage State placed there since women could vote in that State that can not be met by laws equally as good and in some cases better in adjoining male suffrage States.

I assert without fear of successful contradiction that there is not a law for the protection of the working woman found in suffrage States which can not be met by laws equally as good in adjoining male suffrage States.

Suffragists claim that an eight-hour law for women exists only in suffrage States—there are three suffrage States having an eight-hour law and in two of them, California and Washington, the eight-hour law was passed before women had ever voted in those States—but they do not add that a law recognized by all social workers as a *sine qua non* of remedial legislation for working women, namely, night prohibition of labor is not to be found on the statute books

of any suffrage State, while Nebraska, a male suffrage State with practically identical conditions industrially, has had such a law for 12 years.¹

Two years ago Congressman at large Taylor from Colorado delivered an address before a committee of the House of Representatives which was afterwards printed and used as a suffrage document under the private frank of the Congressman. Mr. Taylor recited 150 laws passed by the Legislature of Colorado since woman suffrage had been in force in that State, the inference being that they were the result of the votes of women. I have gone over the entire list in the last day or two and I can say that with the exception of one law relating to the insurance of a young child every law of a remedial character can be found in most of the male suffrage States. The fact that all of these laws can not be found in any one male suffrage State is fully met by the fact that not all the laws of Nebraska, for instance, or of Wisconsin or of Oklahoma or of Texas can be found in any one suffrage State.

Mr. Taylor says that the best child-labor laws in this country are to be found in Colorado. I do not know his authority for that statement and I do not care what it is. I deny the assertion without fear of successful contradiction. I claim that any child-labor law which permits boys of any age and a girl of 10 years to engage in street trades, or children of any age no matter how young, to work in theatrical exhibitions, if only liquors are not sold in the theater,² fails lamentably in comparison with the law of Nevada; for instance, where any child, boy or girl, under 10 years is deemed delinquent if he sells on the street, or the law of Oklahoma, or the laws of New York, or of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, and other male-suffrage States barring boys under 14 and girls under 16 from selling on the street.

The clause in the Colorado law excepting children between 14 and 16 from any provision of the child-labor law if he or she obtains a permit makes it possible to employ a child as young as 14 in places where liquor is sold, while Texas makes the age 15, and in many Eastern States the age is 21.

It is not my intention to dwell at length upon these laws. I cite these instances as proof that the claims made of better laws under woman suffrage do not hold good when the laws themselves are studied.

I hold in my hand a clipping from the New York Sun which was handed me as I came into this chamber this morning, presumably by a suffrage advocate, in which comparisons are made of labor laws in suffrage and nonsuffrage States. This statement issued by the Woman's Political Union does not compare suffrage and nonsuffrage States by States, but by averages; that is, the average age of child workers in suffrage States is compared with the average age of child

¹Three States, Indiana, Massachusetts, and Nebraska prohibit night labor for women of all ages in certain specified employments. Thirteen other States prohibit night labor for very young women who are above the age where they would be protected by the child-labor law. In some States these laws apply to girls between 16 and 18 years and in others between 16 and 21 years of age. This makes at least 16 male suffrage States where there is some prohibition of night labor for women. Other States may have been added to this list since this compilation was made.

²Mr. Owen J. Lovejoy, in an article on child labor in the Review of Labor Legislation for 1911 for the American Association for Labor Legislation, page 73, says of the Colorado law, "Children of any age may be employed in any concert or theatrical exhibition or performance where liquors are not sold."

workers in nonsuffrage States. In getting these averages they have counted 10 States as suffrage States, which includes Oregon, with its splendid child-labor law, passed long before Oregon became a suffrage State; California, with its laws passed under male suffrage, and Illinois, where the votes of women have never helped to write one law upon the statute books. And even then, what is the result. Take the first statement, which is to the effect that in woman suffrage States the average of consent is 17.7 years, while in male suffrage States it is only 16.6 years. Let me call your attention to the fact that the lower the age of consent in a State the higher is the degree of punishment. A State that places the age of consent at 18 or 21 years and the punishment at one year in jail or a fine has, to my mind, a less effective law than the State that makes the age of consent as low as 16 or even 15 years and the penalty from 5 to 20 years in the penitentiary, or, as in some States, a life sentence.

Again the report says that the average age below which children can not be employed in factories is 14.3 years in woman-suffrage States and 14.1 years in male-suffrage States. In this comparison is included in the male-suffrage States all those great industrial States of the South, where for 50 years there has been in progress the rebuilding of a Nation, the rehabilitation of a people, the evolution of a race, in which process the labor of children, even of young children, no matter how much that is to be deprecated, played a necessary part. And yet this comparison of the Woman's Political Union shows only two-tenths of a year advantage on an average of the woman-suffrage States over the male-suffrage States. Nothing that I can say would so utterly disprove the claims of better laws than this comparison, for in those far Western States, with no old legislation to make over, heritors as they are of the experience of older States, their legislation should be in the vanguard or at least equal to the best legislation in the most advanced male-suffrage States if woman suffrage had helped at all.

As a matter of fact, the votes of women, the votes of men have had nothing whatever to do with the question. The question of child labor from the standpoint of the State is a question of the future citizenship of the State, and the increasing protection which is being thrown around the young child who works is the result of modern thought, the evolution of social science. If child-labor laws were due to votes alone, such organizations as the National Child Labor Committee would close their doors. They at least recognize the necessity of molding public opinion in the matter. Theirs is the work which the suffragist sneers at as "indirect influence," but they have written more good legislation upon the statute books of our States for the children who must work than all the votes of men and women combined.

So far as the laws for the protection of property-owning women are concerned, they are to-day in many States better than the laws for the protection of men's property. Neither are the laws for property-owning women in woman-suffrage States in advance of the laws in male-suffrage States. For instance, in at least two of the suffrage States where women have voted long enough to have effected legislation, a man may sell all of his real estate not homesteaded and squander the money without the consent or knowledge of his wife. In at least one of them a woman must under certain circumstances

support her husband. On the other hand, in certain male-suffrage States, like New York and Virginia, a woman may sell every dollar of her real estate and squander the money without the consent of her husband, but her husband can not similarly sell one dollar of his real estate without the signature of his wife.

When our Government was founded we took for our law the old English common law as the best statutes then extant with the promise that this law should be changed from time to time to meet the changing civilization. And it has been changed, and in no respect has this change been greater than in the laws for the protection of women. The movement began in 1841 and curiously enough the first State to pass such laws were the two States most antipodal—Rhode Island, the smallest State, on our northeastern boundary, and Texas, the largest State, on our southwestern boundary. Massachusetts followed and then New York. And every year since has seen the good work go on. Year after year the tide has been rising higher and higher, year after year has seen better and more far-reaching laws placed on the statute books for the protection of women by legislators who are constantly denounced by advocates of woman suffrage as unjustly discriminating against our sex.

Mrs. Susan Fitzgerald, secretary of the National Woman Suffrage Association, said in Michigan last spring, "We women don't want any favors of that kind. We want absolute equality." I don't know what Mrs. Fitzgerald may want. I do not know what the suffrage association may want, but I do know that 90 per cent of the women do want this legislation which discriminates in their favor. They do not want to be placed on exactly the same plane as men where they must give and take as do men and ask no favors although they are not physically equal. We know, and you know, that the very being of the future state demands such legislation.

Both in the making and administering of the law man has given woman a consideration he has denied his own sex, and a preferential and a deferential attitude generally, and I for one believe that we shall have irrevocably retrograded if the day should ever come when that law of "women first," which dominated the sea a year and a half ago, is considered absurd and archaic.

I thank you.

Mrs. DODGE. The next speaker is Miss Emily P. Bissell, of Delaware, who is the president of the Delaware Tuberculosis Society, vice president of the State Consumers' League, and who started the Red Cross Christmas seal in this country.

STATEMENT OF MISS EMILY P. BISSELL, PRESIDENT OF THE DELAWARE TUBERCULOSIS SOCIETY.

MISS BISSELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I know my sex, and I believe in its present power. I know very few women who come anywhere near using the power that they have. I believe, therefore, that when the majority of the women of the United States want to vote, they will do so. Whether it is wise or not they will do so. They will not come up and ask Congress either. They will swing their own States into line without effort. Texas will not have to ask Utah to help her, and New York will not look to

Wyoming to coerce her women into suffrage. This question ought not to be a man's question; it ought to be a woman's question, and it should be left to the women to work out in their own way, in their own States, for it is the women who are going to gain or lose by it. The vote means additional work and worry, and most women do not see enough gain in it to wish it. Some working women may be attracted by the glittering promise that suffrage will raise wages and shorten hours and bring equal pay. That most self-supporting women want it is not true. Some social workers may want the vote as a power or social lever, but the majority still remain indifferent. A large number of them dislike the whole question and consider both suffragist and antisuffragists a bore, with which feeling some of you probably sympathize. Many women have even gone so far as to say that when they hear a suffrage argument they become suffragists and when they hear an antisuffrage argument they become antisuffragists. They are so tired of it they are ready to believe anything.

Now, why should the men endeavor to give woman something to which she is indifferent? Do you suppose for a minute that the majority of women in this country wish to have Congress take up this subject? Why, every woman knows it isn't that. The suffragist's claim is only that the demand of a small minority is valid, and it would be a good thing for the majority of the indifferent women to have the vote forced on them. But that does not seem like good statesmanship in a land where majorities rule. It seems unfair to a State which rests on majorities and unfair to the majority of women. According to the suffragist, they want the vote for five reasons:

First, for the self-supporting woman; second, for the property-owning woman; third, for the single woman, who has no one to look after her interests; fourth, for the temperance woman, who wants prohibition; fifth, for the club woman, interested in public affairs.

As a matter of fact, experience has taught me that in every single one of these five things they do not need the vote. For example, the self-supporting woman, I know that the votes do not raise wages or shorten hours, and the sooner woman gets her mind off of that the better for her. The best laws for women are those of Massachusetts, which is not a suffrage State. No law can help a woman who works to hold her place. There is no royal road to self-support.

I believe in labor laws that will protect the unskilled and helpless women, but those laws could be enacted without the vote just as well as with one, in my experience. Wherever men realize the need of a law for the protection of women they are entirely willing to enact it. Woman has neither the time nor the money to spend on politics. She needs both to do her very best now. Is she doing it? The suffrage cry is "equal pay for equal work," but the practical result is that employers prefer men for the reason that men are more generally useful, more all-around useful than women, and the result of equal opportunity instead of raising wages, as the suffragists told us, has been to depress them. In regard to the claim that the temperance worker needs the ballot, I have found that I did not need anything in such work. I have found that in carrying around temperance petitions, men sign just as willingly as women, and just as often

as the women, and none more than another. I have helped to keep 11 saloons out of our ward, and there has not been 1 saloon in our ward for 24 years. In lower Delaware local option has gone through without suffrage. In suffrage States I do not find that the vote has made remarkable records as to prohibition compared with non-suffrage States. In regard to the holding of property and taxation, the status of the woman and the man are almost the same. In the case of a row of houses owned by men and women, it makes no difference who owns them the taxes are identically the same on all, and with equal suffrage there would be more expenses for election and therefore higher State and county taxes, because all those things have got to come back to the taxpayer in the end. Equal suffrage means that the woman who has never earned anything, never saved money, never has any idea but what the State can pay for all kinds of schemes, will be voting just the same as the thrifty woman, the property owner. Then we must consider the negro women of the South, and it does not seem to me that these ignorant women should be allowed to vote and to impose taxes upon the woman who owns property.

When our last legislature was in session we took up the matter of a child-labor law, and in preparing it we wanted to know what were the best laws on that subject. When I was in Chicago, only last week, I heard Miss Trout, of Illinois, say that Massachusetts had the best child-labor law in the United States. I was told the same thing when we came to take up this law—to look up the labor laws of Massachusetts—and I was not recommended to look at the labor laws of Colorado. In our State we do not allow children to work about the mills until they are 21 years of age, and we have several safeguards that I did not hear Miss Bronson give as to the suffrage States. We have gotten through a 10-hour law for women, and we have been successful in securing tuberculosis legislation. We have secured unanimous votes from Republicans and Democrats alike, from Republicans in the Senate and Democratic assemblies, or vice versa. We women are the only people who have carried through our appropriation bills without having them cut. We were told to ask for twice what we wanted and we would get half, but we said we did not work that way, and we asked for what we wanted and we got it. We were powerful because we had no political entanglements. Women everywhere will realize these facts. We found men always ready to help in legislation for us when the issue is clearly legislation for the public good. We found that the men against us could not even say that we were suffragists, but they had to admit, as one man was heard to say, "She isn't even a suffragist." We do not want the vote in politics. The fact that we were wholly disinterested, working wholly for the public good, brought the public right in line behind us. For this reason, a reason tested and tried, I do not, as some women interested in legislation do, want the vote, and I can safely say that I represent the federation in this cause, for at our last meeting it refused to send a fraternal delegate to the State Equal Suffrage Association.

Our hardest problem this year has been that of keeping objectionable shows out of our State fair. It is quite a problem in many respects. This year our men tried it; the pastors tried and they failed. Then the police came out and closed all the shows, and the next day they opened worse than ever. The federation was appealed to and

we closed the shows up inside of a day by personally inspecting the shows and then going to the fair directors. The shows were closed, but the manager of the grounds was in such a rage at the closing that he insisted on my leaving the grounds. I went out with the honors of war, and the next week the stockholders assured us that such shows will never be allowed in the fair grounds again.

Now, the suffragists tell us that the vote means very much; but I do not believe that the mere dropping of a ballot in the ballot box will move the world. You gentlemen know perfectly well that the only thing that makes that ballot effective is the hard work that your campaign managers have done in getting that vote out. It is by placing men at work through the campaign and keeping it moving that you get results. A single vote is not legislation, but women think it is, because they are so ignorant of politics. An organized vote means work, and more work, and the ordinary woman will be more indifferent to it when she finds out what work it really entails.

The suffragists say that the majority of women do not want to vote because they are not intelligent and are indifferent generally to what they need. If the suffragists are right in this, then they must be wrong in attempting to force the vote upon persons who are so unintelligent and ignorant of what will be good for them. The practical solution, gentlemen, is to let the women vote on the question themselves and let this be decided in every State. That would be a fair test. Such a referendum was tried in 1894 in Massachusetts, with the result that not 4 per cent of the women wanted the ballot. Times may have changed since, but when it was reintroduced last year the suffragists refused this solution. Suffragists want the men to vote and help them force the vote on the majority of the women. We want what we want when we want it, and we don't want the ballot. This is a genuine case of what we do not want. It is not progress to forget the majority and impose something upon us at the request of a very small minority. The Goddess of Liberty does not need the vote and does not want it.

Mrs. DODGE. The next speaker, Mr. Chairman, will be Mrs. A. J. George, the secretary of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

STATEMENT OF MRS. A. J. GEORGE, FIELD SECRETARY OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mrs. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, the proposition before you is to create a "committee on equal rights." There never was a proposition so misleading. Had the proponents of the measure stated their true convictions they would have asked for "a committee on unequal rights," because unless we are to efface all of the remedial and protective legislation with which women in this country have been surrounded by the votes of men, those who ask for the enfranchisement of women are asking for unequal rights. It is my duty to-day to speak of one phase of this question which is not pleasing to discuss, but which is necessary for us in all honesty of mind to consider. Among suffragists a notion seems to obtain that woman suffrage is a planet revolving in an orbit all its own,

or even that it is a planet wholly disconnected from the social planetary system. There are those who contend that you may make this change in woman's relation to the State, a change which Mr. Gladstone termed "revolutionary" and yet not alter anything. But with incredible swiftness in the last six months we have seen some of the beautiful dreams of the more conservative suffragists come crashing to earth, and the logical outcome of the claims of the suffragists is evident.

Every suffragist must consider the responsibility which rests with those who advocate what has come to be known as feminism. If the woman's vote is to mean anything some new social scheme must be formulated to make that vote operative. And schemes a plenty the suffragists furnish us. The family can not be made over in this arbitrary fashion proposed by the suffragists without producing social and moral disaster. As Mr. Asquith says, "We are getting on." An English suffragist, writing in the *Century*, for November, 1913, declares that "There is sex war just as there is class war, and will be until there is world-wide readjustment of human relations." At the close of this extraordinary paper this suffragist-feminist writer acknowledges that "the keystone is falling; woman are refusing, and must refuse to accept the old ideals in the relations between men and women. If they decline to be dependent longer, economically and spiritually, upon men, one of man's greatest spurs to action is taken from him, with no other incentive equally compelling given in its place." The same writer informs us that, "It was St. Paul who laid down the Christian ideal for women, nothing invented of man ever had more stultifying effect upon the character and morals of women and of men." In other words, the 20 centuries which have developed the Christian ideal of womanhood are acknowledged by this writer to be a failure. Compare with this radical doctrine the reply made by the woman whom we all honor, Mrs. Frances M. Scott, the honored first president of the New York State Anti-Suffrage Association:

THE MILITANT AND THE CHILD.

[By Mrs. Francis M. Scott.]

The following words occur almost at the beginning of Edna Kenton's paper on "The militant woman—and women" in the November *Century*: "The middle of the last century saw the stupendous upheaval with the 'Origin of Species' and 'The descent of man' marking the epochal divide." Thereafter follows a brilliant, glittering series of assertions which are never demonstrated, of accusations largely unfounded, and no conclusions at all that the amazed and earnest reader can discover. It is not my purpose, however, to attack Mrs. Kenton's bewildering article in detail nor, indeed, to attack it at all. The woman question or movement is world-wide, it is a part of the immediately modern environment in which we live, it both threatens and blesses, it inspires, it horrifies, and it often amazes.

THE LESSONS OF SCIENCE.

If the "stupendous upheaval" of the nineteenth century had any teaching for us at all, we should have learned at least these things: That specialization of function is a part of the evolutionary process; that differentiation of sex has been of age-long development, and always in one direction, the higher the development the more complete the differentiation; that evolution growth is slow and orderly; that abnormalities die on the way, effecting nothing; that the propagation of any species and its improvement is the only work in which

nature is interested; and, finally, that not until man was reached has there been, so far as we know, any appearance of what we call morality, nor any effort to govern or control or deny the sex desire.

Frankly, I do not know just what is meant by "sex freedom" and "sex war." I do not know whether it means freedom and war for denial or freedom and war for the gratification of the fundamental impulse of life; therefore I am somewhat at a loss. But, as I wish to touch the difficult part of this feminist doctrine as delicately and as frankly as I can, I will not stop for definitions. In the high hysterical mood so characteristic of the arguing woman when she attacks sex questions it is difficult to make her stop and remember that sex intercourse is as natural as breathing, and while not as necessary for life to the individual, here and now at this minute, is a necessity for the creation of the future generations who are to inherit the earth.

The obsession which impels the feminists to let this one aspect of life blot out every other is no more reasonable than an attempt to create a wild excitement on the subject of breathing, letting that important act direct and color every thought. Sanity and common sense demand that an end should be put to the unnatural, and, because unnatural, abhorrent attitude which is being assumed toward a phase of life gravely important, if you like, but not its only controlling influence.

THE CHILD.

The only way in which it should be held to be the controlling influence is in its consequence, and that consequence is utterly ignored in all the present wild talk and action. That consequence is the child.

In Mrs. Kenton's paper there are few allusions to the child. The following are the most important.

A statement that "in homes of one or two children lies another great reservoir of waste energy among women."

A little story of an English mother naturally and properly indignant at the law's ignoring of her claim to be considered legally the "parent" of her child, and held justified thereby in becoming a "wild woman" in spite of her husband's wishes.

The paragraph in which the offensive phrase, "and England * * * still feels that the chief end of life is to spawn soldiers."

That is all. When the law was framed which the woman of the second quotation resents, the father alone was held responsible by the State for the well-being, the education, the feeding, and housing of the child; consequently, he alone was recognized in legal forms regarding the child. All this is an outworn, outgrown condition. The law always lags, for its function is only to confirm, to put into a compulsory form for all what the people have already generally adopted and approved. Changes in the law do not demand fire and stones, but rather such an upbuilding of public opinion as shall force needed changes upon the statute books, as has been done and is still being done continuously in our own country.

It is a little difficult to write temperately of the third of the above quotations. The needless, cruel insult flung at every mother who has given her son to her country defeats itself by its own unworthiness. It is not as spawn that we would consider the overlooked, the forgotten, the deliberately ignored child. There are many other things written of by Mrs. Kenton—votes for women, office for women, economic independence for women, war for women, bombs and fire, hammers and stones, rioting and hunger striking, and, at last, sex freedom and sex war for women! But what of the child? This fierce individualism which clutches at everything it sees, where will it bring the succeeding generations which must suffer for the madness which urges these women on beyond all reason?

HUMAN GOVERNMENT.

Human society has slowly climbed from unspeakable depths of ignorance to its present place, from which it can at last take stock of itself, and, learning from its past, continue with intention and self-knowledge its upward way. The various forms of government which men have agreed to impose upon themselves have brought about in the last 500 years changes that are stupendous, changes that are, generally speaking, all for the betterment of the human race and all these changes for good have been wrought with the help of and under the control of what this article characterizes as "the blind, stupid, heavy thing that men conceive to be government."

What conception of government the feminists have it is difficult to comprehend. Mrs. Pankhurst, the high priestess of militancy, according to the newspaper reports, has just declared that "at last women have learned the joy of war, a joy too long withheld from them by men." Yet the despised men are outgrowing war, and more and more regarding it as only the last bitter resort, not a joy.

THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY.

To quote further: "Perhaps the new psychology of the human race will have for its starting point neither male nor female, but the individual and its own." What does this mean? Are we then to be modestly aware of gender only and lose our hard-earned sex, to be a possessive neuter, or are we to return to a dividing cell form of reproduction. Pseudo-science, to the informed, is only laughable and such a sentence as the above, if not entirely meaningless, shows an amazing misapprehension of the stately march of human development.

That march includes, must include, the intellectual development of the whole race, women and men alike. No real difference of opinion exists on this point among intelligent, thoughtful persons, and no one desires to withhold from any human being the opportunity to fulfill him or herself. Let us grant this before we go further. I speak with assurance for every one of those with whom I have been associated in opposing votes for women. The vote is only a way of avoiding a physical contest over every difference of opinion. It is a convenience, a method of compromise, a very human and fallible instrument for the expression of the will of the people, but it has been made the war cry, the shibboleth, the crux of this modern movement. The desire for what it has come to mean has given birth to the militant woman. Mrs. Kenton is right when she says that "Militancy is not a disease, it is a symptom." Militancy is the discharging ulcer of the insidious disease of feminism.

SERVICE.

"Every woman is a servant to or of some one or some thing, the servant half of the human race." Why this scorn? Is service then a contemptible thing? Have the long ages of the world rolled on and has the human race not yet learned that service is all there is of life, that individual freedom is a myth, that we work, suffer, love, and are glad together, that even at birth and death our lives rest on others, and that not our slightest act, perhaps not our slightest thought, is without its shaping influence?

Some years ago Benjamin Kidd wrote a notable book on western civilization. He therein deduced from his examination of the law made and in process of making, from the lectures he heard, the conversations he had, and the keen observation he used in all his various inquiries, that the principle which inspired the civilization of western countries was that of preparation for the future of the race, its physical and moral welfare, and to provide more perfect conditions for its development and growth. Such an admirable and dignified and worth-while principle is not animating these "wild women" who demand sex freedom, sex war, the legalized destruction of unborn children, economic freedom, and war any way. They willfully misconstrue service into slavery, unless it is impersonal service, and demand a liberty amounting to license.

THE OLD IDEALS.

When the feminists "refuse to accept the old ideals of the relations between men and women" what do they mean to substitute? The "ideals" have been good and pure ones, the following them, the practice, has too often been another matter, but if we can not look to our women to conserve the purity of the family then we must abandon the family, and only a very few of the most logical of these women see the necessity of this conclusion and, alas, accept it.

"It is a wise child that knoweth his own father," but, unless he can trust the woman, no man can know his own child, while no woman can be mistaken as to the paternity of hers. All a man's faith must rest on the woman. For her children's sake should she not carry her torch of purity high? This is no plea for a double standard of chastity. Let there be but one, and let it be the woman's, but because men since the history of the race began have been lax,

do not let us, in proof of our emancipation, put ourselves, as Mrs. Kenton suggests, outside the "pale of mere convention," by breaking laws "as a protest against the lawmakers in power."

The stress laid upon economic freedom, and its "spiritual necessity" is out of all proportion to its importance. Marriage is a partnership, in which there should be a fair and equitable division of the labor of the family, and the first requisite of the woman's share in that partnership must be her freedom to consider first the welfare of the child, the future citizen, and nothing should be undertaken by the mother which might interfere with that most important duty.

It is for this reason, and this alone, that wherever possible a woman with children should be relieved of responsibilities which take her out of her home. It is because she may be needed, and needed imperatively, that it is wrong for her to undertake work the proper attention to which compels her to be constantly and regularly away from her home. This does not make her a slave to her husband, nor even to her children. It does, however, and should, make both mother and father the slaves of the future as foreshadowed in the child.

WILD RIOT WILL DIE DOWN.

Fortunately this stormy gust which threatens to overwhelm us will be succeeded by a period of quiet, for the winds do not blow always. We are too close as yet to discern the wheat below the chaff which is blowing in our eyes, and then the sound of the wind is deafening. We may be sure that the feminists will not alter the human race, although for a little time they may harmfully and wantonly disturb some part of it. The wild riot of individualism will die down and the temple of service will stand clear again on the eternal hills. The little child shall again lead us, and we shall build painstakingly and slowly for the future of the race, having learned that we must take nature for our teacher, abide by her laws, follow her precepts, and reach such perfection as we may through constructive effort, and not by the incendiary, ungoverned haste and impetuosity of the militant woman.

Marriage is a partnership in which there should be a fair and equitable division of the labor of the family, and the first requisite of the woman in that partnership must be her freedom to consider, first, the welfare, not of the woman, as the feminist says, but of the child, and nothing should be undertaken by the mother which might interfere with that most important duty. It is for this reason and this alone that wherever possible women with children should be relieved of responsibilities which would of necessity take her out of her home.

The suffragists recognize that all their theories rest on a basis of economic independence for women. The fact that the theory of the economic independence of women is associated with the woman-suffrage movement in England is attested by the following quotation from a pamphlet by Christabel Pankhurst. This pamphlet was purchased at the headquarters of the Woman Suffrage Party; therefore it may be fairly assumed that the doctrines are, at least, not repudiated by the organized woman suffragists of America.

Another aspect of the problem is economic. More and more woman is becoming persuaded in the fact that, both in marriage and out of it, she must be economically independent, and there must be no question of living by sale of sex. For sex is degraded by any hint of sale or barter. * * * Social reformers, who attach so great an importance to the economic side of every problem, ought to be the first to realize that in the reforming of social conditions it is not enough to put the husband in possession of larger means, and that to every adult individual, man or woman, wife or maid, must be secured economic independence. And yet it is often they who uphold the reactionary theory that men and women ought not to be economically independent. The system under which a married woman must derive her livelihood from her husband, must eat out of his hand, as it were, is a great bulwark of sex subjection, and is a great reinforcement to prostitution. * * * Of course married people will always be free to make such arrangements as suit their own case, but the typical marriage will in days to come be the one in which the wife is economically independent. (From Plain Facts About a Great Evil, by Christabel Pankhurst.)

A writer in Harper's Weekly, of September 27, 1913, pleads the case of the Younger Suffragist. She assures us that "there are within the fold of modern franchise seekers a number of women who consider the vote the merest tool, a means to an end, that end being a complete social revolution," and she bases her "social revolution" entirely upon the economic independence of women.

A writer in a Boston paper, speaking for the suffrage association of her town says, "In the day when women shall vote, woman's position as a parasite, whether as kept mistress, or kept wife, will disappear."

Mrs. Philip Snowden is reported to have said at Dayton, Ohio, that the woman who allowed her father or her brother, or even her husband to support her was little better than the kept woman of the streets. This is strong talk, gentlemen. It comes from the advocates of woman suffrage. Some of our suffrage friends seek to repudiate these statements. They say, "These are the utterances of radicals," which always form what Col. Roosevelt has called "the fringe of lunacy" about any progressive movement. But what shall we say to this? A pamphlet which bears the imprint of the National Woman Suffrage Association, and is entitled, "Bond women." There is published by the National American Woman Suffrage Association a bibliography on woman suffrage, and this bibliography gives stars of praise to arguments for woman suffrage. That which I will read to you has three out of the maximum of seven "stars of praise." It does emanate from the "fringe of lunacy."

BONDWOMEN.

[Published by the National American Woman Suffrage Association.]

The freewoman must produce within herself strength sufficient to provide for herself and for those of whom nature has made her the natural guardian, her children. * * *

She must be in a position to bear children if she wants them without soliciting maintenance from any man, whoever he may be.

Then on pages 13 and 14 we find this doctrine pushed still further:

Feminism would hold that it is neither desirable nor necessary for women, when they are mothers, to leave their chosen money-earning work for any length of time. The fact that they so often do so largely rests on tradition, which has to be worn down. In wearing it down vast changes must take place in social conditions, in housing, in nursing, kindergartens, education, cooking, cleaning, in the industrial world, and in the professions. These changes will have for their motive the accommodation of such conditions as will enable women to choose and follow a life work, apart from and in addition to their natural function of reproduction.

There follows an advertisement of suffrage and feminist literature for sale by the National American Woman Suffrage Association of New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you please make a synopsis of these documents that you speak of, so far as may relate to this matter, and insert them in the record? Also state specifically, please, the point that is made in each one of them.

Mrs. GEORGE. I shall be happy to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, we will not want anything to be inserted at length, but just a short statement of it. Be careful in making the statement to put in only that which can be substantiated. Of course, we want the record to state the truth.

Mrs. GEORGE. This is strong doctrine, but the only consistent suffragist is the one who is prepared to follow the feminist to the last conclusion of her original proposition, and the fact that many suffragists hide in alluring byways must not blind us to the fact that in every demand for woman suffrage is the demand that women shall have economic independence of men, and that is only accomplished by social independence and sexual independence.

Mrs. Catt, in 1909, when president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, foreshadowed this doctrine by a statement over her own signature in *Collier's Weekly*, when she said, "If a woman possess ability, great or small, talent, genius, lofty ideals, shall she contribute these directly to the welfare of the world or through the doubtful channels of influence of her husband and children? The feminist is new in name; we have had her long with us, though in disguise. The secretary of the National American Woman Suffrage Association says, "Most progressive people are agreed that the wife should be economically independent of her husband." Therefore she proposes shifts of five hours whereby the mother shall be employed in gainful occupation outside the home five hours and shall be employed in the home in caring for the children five hours; while the father takes his turn in gainful occupation for five hours and then returns to be employed five hours in caring for the children. Some such new scheme is necessary to put into operation this demand of the suffragists, and we are coming to see what the good Queen Victoria meant when she called on every woman who could write or speak against "the mad wicked folly of woman suffrage."

Women vote in the State of Washington. There are two women members on the Washington State Industrial Commission, and on October 22, 1913, these two voting women brought in a report which declared that the commission had no right to concern itself with the morals of the working women; that the only concern of the commission was to see that the women had proper conditions of work. Yet all over the country, without the vote, we have placed women on vice commissions, interested in the morals of women, who believe that we are concerned with the morality of women because we are concerned with the sound citizenship of the next generation. You may say the feminist theory has not yet developed in Colorado, Idaho, and Wyoming. But some things have happened, gentlemen. This is Exhibit A [exhibiting red pennant, "Votes for Women"]. This banner was carried up Pennsylvania Avenue in the suffrage parade on March 3, 1913. It is not the suffrage yellow, you will notice. It was carried in the socialistic contingent of the parade which moved to the sound of the "Marsellaise," and the contingent was headed by a banner saying "One million socialists vote and work for women suffrage." By socialists we do not refer to those who stand for the brotherhood of humanity, but we mean the organized political party which voted for Eugene V. Debs for President of the United States November 5, 1912. When the attention of the president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association was called to this fact, she said, "We welcome every socialistic vote."

Some other things are happening. How about the indorsement of militancy? With one exception, no suffrage organization in this

country has had the courage—has had the patriotism—to repudiate the methods of the English militants, and on Tuesday night here in Washington the president of the National Suffrage Association said that we might come to the hatchet method of advancing civilization if women were not enfranchised. We can safely wait until those who advocate woman's suffrage show a clearer discernment of the issues of right and wrong than they show in condoning—since they do not condemn—the methods of the militants, before we adopt their suggested methods of contributing woman's service to the State.

There are a great number of honest, sincere, zealous, and devoted women who ask for woman's suffrage, but it is quite possible to have a union of high aspirations and humanitarian impulses with a general incompetence as political thinkers, and we have a manifestation of this incompetence in the indorsement of militancy.

Daniel De Leon, a distinguished socialistic writer, says, "Woman suffrage is an integral splinter in the torch that lights the pathway of the social revolution." I have endeavored to quote suffrage authority to show the suffrage hope of a social revolution of another sort.

Because of these feminists and because woman to-day has ample opportunity for all her abilities if she will do the work which is before her, we protest again the formation of any committee which shall encourage those who at least are in sympathy with those who hold these radical doctrines.

I thank you.

Mrs. DODGE. We are going to make a little variety in this hearing at this point, Mr. Chairman. The next speaker will be Mr. Underhill, who represents the Antisuffrage Men's League of Massachusetts.

**STATEMENT OF MR. CHARLES L. UNDERHILL, REPRESENTING
THE MEN'S ANTISUFFRAGE LEAGUE OF MASSACHUSETTS.**

MR. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, it seems almost sacrilegious to take this discussion out of the high plane in which it has been placed by the women and descend to sordid soil and the sordid plane of politics; but I suppose, having had some experience in that line of work, that I may be excused, perhaps, if I dwell a little upon that side of the question. As I understand it, this committee can go no further here than to request the House for the creation of a committee on woman suffrage, and the things to consider are certain results if such action is taken. The Democratic Party can not create the proposed woman suffrage committee for the purpose for which it may be created without departing from fundamental Democratic principles. It can not put into the headlines of the newspapers the news of such sentiment without committing the party definitely to woman suffrage. There are printed and put upon the streets of the cities and towns of this country every day 2,600 newspapers, and they have a circulation of 24,000,000 copies. This means that they are read by more than 70,000,000 people day in and day out. And the headlines of these newspapers mold public sentiment.

Some man has said that he cared not who shaped the editorial policy of his paper, so long as he was permitted to write its head-

lines. There is an earnest warning that must come home to the Committee on Rules to-day. It is wholly probable that if you recommend the creation of a committee on woman suffrage, your action will be displayed in big black headlines and stereotyped phrases before 70,000,000 people of this country. The reading public will determine in a second, or the fraction of a second, that the Democratic Party favors woman suffrage. They will not stop to read the article and see what lies behind it. Every man who reads it will ask himself, "If the Democrats do not favor woman suffrage, why do they encourage the movement by creating a special committee to devote its time to this principle?" And there is the answer to this that the Democrats, the Democrats of States rights belief, favor Federal control of the State's electors.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think that if we were to inform these newspaper men not to do that, they would obey us? [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERHILL. I am not familiar with the State from which you come, but in Massachusetts it would have no influence whatever.

That is why the suffragists ask you to report favorably upon this proposition. It will be the biggest advertising that they can possibly obtain. It would be their most effective argument in the campaign which they will wage next year for woman suffrage in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nevada, and Montana. They will describe it as their capture of a great political party. That is what they would do, and their description would be accepted as true. It may be that the Democrats can create a committee on woman suffrage without committing the party to it, but this is a distinction too fine to be conveyed to the average mind by the big type that will catch 70,000,000 pairs of eyes. Create a committee on woman suffrage now and you will hear the command to write a woman-suffrage plank into the next Democratic national platform, and afterwards to undertake the work of mutilating the Constitution, so that in spite of all things Orientals may hold the balance of power on the Pacific coast, religion predominate in politics in New England, and negro women may have the deciding vote in shaping the policies of the Southern States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I may be criticized by those who do not know for saying a word about the Southern States and their great problems. They know how to take care of them, and I am in absolute sympathy with them, having been born in Virginia, and I know what they are up against. But in my adopted State of Massachusetts, in our political problems, we have found, with the introduction of women—only so far as the school vote is concerned—that it has brought into our politics and schools the question of religion, a question that man has always tried to keep out of politics. And if I may be allowed to express a personal sentiment, I want to say that I have no prejudice in regard to that matter. I was the leader in the opposition some two years ago to the A. P. A. movement there that obtained so much strength and power. So I will say to you that in Massachusetts, with woman's vote for school committees, we have had more trouble and more difficulties than all of the advantages which we have obtained from the vote of women. For instance, in my own city, to-day there is a most bitter campaign going on with regard to school committees. Why? We cast some two years ago about 10 per cent of the registered women's vote, and

I think the registered vote there is about 2 per cent of what would be the vote if all the women registered. A young fellow 21 years of age, just entering college, took the question of religion and carried it into his campaign for the school committee, and he got the women in his vicinity, in my district, to register, and he was elected. This year the women of the opposite religious belief have gone into politics, and have gone to the city hall and registered in order that they may get out and fight some of the other religions. This is only what has occurred in the cities of Lowell, Fall River, Marlboro, and Cambridge. Some years ago in the city of Cambridge there was cast 85 per cent of the registered woman's vote, and they had a large vote, but now, after two years, there is less than 2 per cent of the women of Cambridge who vote. Two years ago in the city of Lowell 2 per cent of the women voted. They had a fight on the school committee on religious lines, and they registered almost 10,000 women there, and they fought it out along those lines. Now, you see we have our problems in Massachusetts. It is not necessary, perhaps, for me to go into the figures in regard to this matter.

The question of religion is going to predominate in our politics, because the women introduced it. It has been kept out of politics by the men.

MR. POT. Might I interrupt to ask if as a general proposition the men are opposed to the right of women to vote at school elections?

MR. UNDERHILL. As a general proposition, I do not feel that my experience has shown it has been of any particular value to the school committee. I think, so far as that is concerned, in our schools it makes no difference whether they are Catholic or Protestant, the result is the same. We have Protestants—radical ones—going into Catholic communities and creating trouble, and, on the other hand, we have Catholics going into Protestant communities and creating trouble. The only question which seems to interest them is simply the question of which religion is going to dominate and control the school committee. That has been our experience.

Now, with regard to other things which have happened in Massachusetts. Only last year, in the legislature there, we agreed to put up to the women—or rather to the men—a test vote of woman suffrage. Would the women be willing to have a test vote in Massachusetts on the question of woman suffrage? No, sir. After the bill had passed the house their principal efforts were directed toward influencing the senate to bring in an adverse report on it, for they knew in Massachusetts it would be defeated. At that time they did not realize that one of the referendums to be put upon the bill provided that it should be voted on a little later, and the vote this fall showed absolutely that the people of Massachusetts were opposed to woman suffrage.

In a recent election, on the question of women being notary publics, there were 30,000 votes against the measure, although the antisuffragists did not oppose it, thus showing the general fear that this might be an opening wedge for woman suffrage. Strange to say, the Democratic Party in Massachusetts has sometimes flirted with the suffragists, but in the Democratic vote throughout Massachusetts the vote was overwhelmingly against this proposition, and this occurs also at such places as were controlled by the Republicans.

That shows the sentiment in Massachusetts, and I do not believe we would care to have you interfere here in Congress with our privileges in Massachusetts along the lines of election laws. We have there an election commission to which some of these questions are referred. We have in our legislature a very efficient committee on constitutional amendments, to which some of these questions are referred. We have a judiciary committee, as you have here, which has handled some of these questions, and I think that your Judiciary Committee is well able to handle the questions as they come up to them, and I warn you that if you frame a special committee on this proposition your troubles will be greatly multiplied, if the indications all over the country are as they are in Massachusetts.

One of the worst features of the entering of women into politics has appeared in Massachusetts. I have been a member of the legislature there for eight years, and when I first entered the house I found that those who were agitating woman suffrage were treated with the respect and courtesy that all of the women in Massachusetts were entitled to and were receiving from her men; but, strange to say—and perhaps it is not so strange to say, as you may look at it—for the last two years there has been a decided change, and where you formerly heard through the legislative corridors and through the halls of the legislative assemblies reference to “Mrs. So-and-so” and “Miss So-and-so,” who were advocating woman suffrage, we now hear them referred to invariably—not, mind you, by those opposed to woman suffrage, but by those who vote for it and speak for it—you hear them referred to as “Mag” and “Sweet Alice” and “Dear Susan” and “old Mrs. So-and-so.” They are rarely given the title which they deserve and which they should have, of Mrs. or Miss, and it seems to me that this entrance of women into politics has resulted in contempt, familiarity, and ridicule which they can ill afford, and it does not seem to me that it is proper.

Now, let me have a word to say on the methods which the women have used—and I speak for Massachusetts rather than any other section, for I am not familiar with conditions as they exist elsewhere. In Massachusetts we have, as one of the ladies has said, the best child-labor laws in the country. We have, I think, the best women-labor laws in the country there—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). In regard to the child-labor law, I am not so certain about that since the Lawrence strike. We had a hearing here about that, and we are not convinced that they have in Massachusetts the best child-labor law in the Union.

Mr. UNDERHILL. When we found matters surrounding conditions such as they were at Lawrence, the legislature took that matter up and we had additional child-labor legislation. So it only needs conditions to arise and be brought to the attention of the Legislature of Massachusetts to have them remedied.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is gratified to know that you have amended the law.

Mr. UNDERHILL. We have amended the law, and, strange to say, the laboring people of the Commonwealth are the most bitter opponents of the new law, but they undoubtedly will be educated up to it. As one of the previous speakers has said, we allow no employment of children under 21 years of age in places where liquor is sold, and we do not allow children to go to work in the mills or factories

until they are over 14, and not until they are 16 unless they can read and write fluently the English language. We do not allow them to enter the dangerous occupations until they are 18, and some of the dangerous occupations are taken away from them until they are 21 years of age. We have had this legislation put upon the statute books by men who have been educated in Massachusetts.

And I want to call your attention to the fact that the women of Massachusetts, both pro and anti, have given us a great deal of assistance in placing these laws upon the statute books, but strange to say during the last two years many of the legislators who have refused to vote for woman suffrage, although they have stood at the forefront of the battle in behalf of every child-labor legislation, in behalf of better hours and better wages for women, in behalf of better school conditions, in behalf of everything that the woman suffragists say they desire the ballot for in order that they may vote for them—these men who have stood at the forefront of the battle for these things have been opposed at the elections and primaries by the woman suffragists without a single qualifying adjective being brought forward in any way, shape, or form, for the things which they have done. They have been fought simply because they opposed woman suffrage, and all that they have done for the things which women advocated have gone for naught. The women have endeavored to defeat them without inquiring anything about how the other man was going to vote on any of these questions, but just simply how was he going to vote on woman suffrage.

Mr. Pou. You have given the attitude of those opposed to woman suffrage and child labor. What has been the experience of the legislature regarding the attitude of those opposed to child labor with reference to woman's suffrage?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Those who have opposed child-labor legislation have been, strange to say, the working men and the working women.

Mr. Pou. But in the legislature?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Those who have opposed legislation of that nature have been men who have come from the mill centers, and they have been men who invariably stood for woman suffrage. [Applause.] We have a peculiar condition in Massachusetts. There seems to be only one question and that is, "Are you going to vote for woman suffrage?" If you are not going to vote for woman suffrage, the fact that you may be a temperance advocate or advocate good legislation along that line, the fact that you say you are in favor of the most radical legislation for the benefit of womankind, the fact that you may support bill after bill in behalf of child labor, the fact that you may vote for every improvement question, from white slavery down—that has nothing to do with the question. You simply must be an advocate of woman suffrage or else you are absolutely no good as a legislator. I bring that forward so that you may see some of the things that will come before the new committee, if you report the resolution for a Committee on Woman Suffrage. There will be nothing in this world more important. I see in one of the newspapers this morning that the suffragists consider the currency bill a minor matter, that should be sidetracked until this great subject of suffrage is settled.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have simply touched upon the political side of this question. I have just one word to say about

the side these women so nicely presented, and that is I have heard it said somewhere that when anyone said "Everybody is talking about him" it is a eulogy, but when anybody says "Everybody is talking about her" it is an elegy. So I leave that to you.

Mrs. DODGE. Mr. Chairman, I know we have taken up a little more time than we intended as we went along. I am going to ask a speaker to address you who is not on the regular program, because she came on short notice. She comes from California and was a suffrage worker, and now she wishes to say that from her experience she does not think that woman suffrage is working out well in California. I will introduce Miss Annie Bock.

STATEMENT OF MISS ANNIE BOCK, OF LOS ANGELES, CAL.

Miss Bock. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I come just a woman, speaking for my fireside, for my flag, and my faith. I have no meaningless, intangible, garbled statistics to present, no profound philosophy to expound, nothing to tell but my own simple experiences and things that have been called to my personal attention. I had expected to be in old Madrid now, but here I am. I want to tell once more in Washington how very depressed I feel to think I ever worked for woman suffrage.

Last August in my address, which was ordered printed by the United States Senate by the kindness of Senator Martine, I endeavored to show that woman suffrage is a failure for the following reasons:

One. That woman does not care for the ballot.

Two. That a few women are trying to force it on all women.

Three. That woman seeks political honors.

Four. That she is intolerant.

Five. That enfranchisement robs woman of her finer qualities and changes the attitude of man.

Six. That woman has proved herself not profound but impulsive.

Seven. That the capitalist is condemned for child labor and the low wage of woman and for the evils that they say result therefrom.

Eight. That women use unfair means to urge their cause.

Nine. That they indorse militancy.

Ten. That the suffrage movement is fundamentally socialistic.

Now by additional observations I would emphasize some of the points therein made. Do women want the ballot? When at voting times I went about urging women to do their duty and vote, these were some of the things they said to me: "I have not registered," came from some. "My son supports me and does not care to have me vote," replied a sweet-faced woman in widow's weeds. "You had better go in off the street," a resentful one said to me. "I do not care to vote," responded another. "My father and husband do the voting for our family," was said in a self-satisfied tone by another. A big Irish woman screamed, "Vote? And sure, Tim would beat the life out of me if I voted, and sure I'd deserve it." "I am not going to vote. I think that if every girl does just the best she knows how she does not need to vote," was the expression of a department store girl.

Anyone can get like answers over and over again if she goes about it like I did.

In the July Clubwoman, the official organ for the California State Federation for Women's Clubs, Mrs. Swan, chairman, of legislation and an ardent suffragist, writes:

It is a big reflection upon woman's support of woman to recall that in Sacramento our own club woman, Mrs. Ella B. Johnson, the only city commissioner in the United States, doing excellent work as commissioner of education, was defeated at the polls for reelection. Though the interested ones worked hard, the indifferent ones by staying at home played into the hands of politicians, and she was lost to the city.

Remember, the above words are from a suffragist, gentlemen, and she tells that the women do not vote.

The second point made in my address was that a few women are trying to force the ballot on all women. This was forcibly demonstrated when a few women came to you last August and, with their speeches and scores of times through the public press, stated that they represented 4,000,000 women voters. I protested that they did not represent me; and I believe that upon investigation you will find that in all the suffrage States there are less than 3,400,000 women over 21, and that out of that number 2,500,000 would be a liberal estimate of those eligible to vote. Thousands of this 2,500,000 are not registered and will never register. But of those who have voted, gentlemen, those whom the suffragists claim they represented, there are thousands, as the decreasing woman's vote in California will indicate, who do not want to vote. Also, there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of others who vote every time whom those women did not represent. There are three of these women in my own family, who all vote with a protest in their hearts and on their lips. Surely these suffragists did not represent us. In the apartment where I lived it required considerable urging to get some of the women to vote who did. Even though they voted, do you think the suffragists represented them? No. They all hated suffrage, and I think that many a one bore a grudge against me for reminding her of her duties to her State and country.

Anyone would think, gentlemen, to hear the noise they make or to listen to the impassioned talk, that all the women of this country have risen as one great surging army and importuned this handful of agitators to go forth and demand the ballot for woman, while actually thousands of women do not know, and do not want to know, anything about it. Furthermore, there are hundreds of women, yes, and men, that are in the suffrage ranks, whose knowledge of suffrage goes no further than the thought, "Man has the vote, why not woman?" When they grasp the full import of woman's suffrage—like me they will combat it.

Some of the arguments used in California to gain votes for women were: The women did not wish to hold office or have political honors thrust upon them, but they desired the ballot that they might vote only good men into office and vote only for good and just measures. But suffrage came, and what happened? Women who lead at clubs pushed themselves into politics and new societies with ambiguous names sprang into existence to help bring woman forward on civic boards, and just casually, of course, to suggest her, and then run her for office. The mayor and the governor when they had appointments to make were besought by women. Women clamored for representa-

tion in the city council and on the board of education. The offices of justice of the peace, police judge, judge of the superior court looked good to her. Women railed in clubs and said, "This can never be right until woman is represented in the legislature." The woman's paper of University City, St. Louis, printed the following telegram sent by a Los Angeles woman to President Wilson when he was elected:

Accept my congratulations. In making up your cabinet, please consider the women of the 10 suffrage States. As a member of your Cabinet, a wise, scholarly woman would bring to your councils great assistance.

An article in a November number of Collier's suggested a woman as the next governor of California. It looks as though women had asked to sit in every chair but that of the President.

For years suffragists expressed their ideas with practically no interference. They said anything they wanted to without being contradicted. Even to-day they let the uninformed take the expressions of the suffragists as gospel, probably because the Rev. Anna Shaw is at their head. As woman suffragists have become more aggressive, however, some unbiased people, desiring absolute information, have crossed our country and made investigations in suffrage States which disproved the assertions of the suffragists, to the extent that the Rev. Anna Shaw feels called upon in an article in a November magazine to say:

All that suffragists demand is the opportunity to use the ballot on equal terms with men, and quite naturally they resent being asked if they will improve legislation with their ballot, if they will use their ballots faithfully, if they will or will not run for office, if they will or will not neglect their homes, and all the other absurd "ifs" when men are never questioned in any of these ways before being enfranchised.

Are these "ifs" so absurd? One of your colleagues has said that no man really wishes to give suffrage to woman. No; it is only when man lets his generosity of spirit get away with his better judgment that he allows his prejudices to be overcome and wants to give her the ballot. California women would never have had the burden of suffrage put upon them if the prejudice of some men had not been overcome by some fair suffragist saying, "Woman wants to vote and you would not be so ungallant as to deny her the privilege," and if the prejudice of other men had not been overcome because they were assured their homes would not be neglected, and if the prejudice of still more men had not been overcome by suffragists declaring woman did not want office, and if the prejudice of still other men had not been overcome because it was asserted woman improves legislation. When it is known that suffrage was largely brought into California due to these statements, why this feeling of resentment unless it be that the suffragists can no longer honestly use these arguments in their propaganda?

The intolerance and smallness of suffragists when they claim to be working for the advancement of woman, and when at the same time they are fairly bursting with humanitarianism, is apparent everywhere and can be forcibly demonstrated by the treatment accorded me when the object of my visit to Washington last August had become known to them. The Los Angeles Herald, of August 27, prints the following letter from Mrs. Foltz in reply to Miss Flora Wilson,

of Washington, who had written to Mrs. Foltz to know the reason of my stand on woman's suffrage:

MY DEAR MISS WILSON: Replying to your letter about Miss Bock, I must say I know very little about her. Her view as to the successful operation of woman's suffrage in California cuts no figure, for the simple reason that her experience is without merit. I think she was a secretary of some sort with a suffrage club. She certainly gave very little evidence of deep thinking on suffrage, and certainly, so far as her activities were involved, it was negligible, entirely so. We came in touch with all of the women who fought in the campaign, but I was barely aware of Miss Bock's existence. Each and every charge that she makes is false and can only work harm if easterners, who might take her seriously, not knowing she is absolutely of no importance here.

Now, let us review this letter. It begins, "Replying to your letter about Miss Bock, I must say that I certainly know very little about her. I came in touch with all the women of importance in the campaign, but I was barely aware of Miss Bock's existence."

I wonder if I could bring myself more forcibly to the mind of this woman who barely knows of my existence. Has Mrs. Foltz forgotten when she started a woman's political headquarters in the Merchants' Trust Building where her office is, and that she made herself president while she had me act as secretary and manager, while she attended to her law practice? Has she forgotten that she telephoned me she was going to form the Million Club and wanted me present at the preliminary meeting, as she wished me to have some office? It is strange she should offer an office to a person of no importance. Has she forgotten the little speech she made at Blanchard Hall when at the finish she almost ran across the floor and, referring to her talk, asked me, "How did I do, dearie?"

If she can not recall these instances I might introduce her to hundreds of people from San Diego to Seattle of more or less importance who might help her to recall my existence. She then continues, "I think Miss Bock was a secretary of some sort with a suffrage club." She put it this way to belittle me, as well as the club, of which she always seemed jealous. Mrs. Foltz knows absolutely that I was secretary of the California Political Equality League, the largest suffrage organization of California, and I believe she also knows that I was secretary of the Los Angeles branch of the College Equal Suffrage League, both of which I served without compensation. If she has doubts she can easily inform herself. Again, Mrs. Foltz continues, "Miss Bock's views as to the successful operation of woman's suffrage in California cut no figure here, for the simple reason that her experience is without merit." Why this awful howl from California suffragists if my experience has no merit? Why, if my views cut no figure there, were the suffragists, according to the Los Angeles Herald of August 15, shocked by the dispatch from Washington that Miss Annie Bock, who was one of the foremost workers in the ranks of the California campaign, had declared woman's suffrage a failure? Why, upon being interviewed by this paper, did one prominent club woman and suffragist say, "Oh, I could cry. Miss Bock is insane if she said that, but I am afraid she did. I think the fact that many of us who fought for suffrage studied social problems led her to get some wild and woolly ideas of the suffrage movement. She thought such subjects were unladylike and insanely condemned progressiveness as a result. It was her fanatical prudery that has driven her to this. It may do incalculable harm, for she appears convincing, has

a pleasing personality, and may have weight with people who do not know that her mind has been warped." Gentlemen, I am willing to have any reputable alienist, not a woman, pass on my mental capacity.

To quote all the interviews is unnecessary, but the remark of one other woman might be interesting. "I decline to believe," she says, "that if Annie Bock ever intends to return to Los Angeles she would have dared to make such an idiotic statement. She is foolish, but not so foolish as that." Gentlemen, I am pronounced insane, and my return to my beloved home is threatened.

Let us return to Clara Shortridge Foltz. She concludes her letter thus: "Each every charge that Miss Bock makes is absolutely false and can only work harm among easterners, who might take her seriously, not knowing she is of absolutely no importance here." That sentence is faulty in construction and quite illogical if correctly printed, though it comes from the pen of a woman who sought to be judge of the superior court. My each and every charge concerning suffrage in California is absolutely false, says Mrs. Foltz. I claim now, and shall ever continue to claim, that my statements are true, and that one of them—that woman seeks political honors—is proven by the very act of Mrs. Foltz when she allowed herself to be suggested as police judge, and when she applied to the governor to be made a superior judge, when she telegraphed to the President suggesting a woman in his cabinet. A second charge I made—that enfranchisement robs woman of her finer qualities, which changes the attitude of man—is brought out and emphasized by Mrs. Foltz, who concludes a letter to the Rev. Anna Shaw, relative to suffrage and Mrs. Pankhurst's visit to this country, with these words: "I firmly believe that the breach between the sexes is widening, and we shall reap a harvest we had not intended to sow if a halt is not called." This was expressed by me last August, when, in speaking of the changed attitude of men, I said, "There is a subtle something abroad that one can better feel than describe." Are the scales fallen from the eyes of Mrs. Foltz? She is a courageous woman, a woman who shouts for the flag, a woman who, I believe, would sacrifice much to uphold our Constitution. One day, when the scales have all fallen from her eyes, she will grasp the full meaning of woman suffrage, and then she will put aside all selfishness, subdue her pride, and, sad and depressed, she, too, will come out and make honest confession.

Gentlemen, I consider Mrs. Foltz of sufficient importance to repeat her words printed in the Los Angeles Herald of October 15, "I firmly believe that the breach between the sexes is widening and we shall reap a harvest we had not intended to sow if a halt is not called." Acting on Mrs. Foltz's suggestion, could there be a better time than now to call a halt?

A National Socialist lecturer, speaking in Los Angeles, said: "Comrades, people think there are as many kinds of socialism as there are Heinz varieties, but there are not. There is only one kind. Remember, comrades, there is only one kind, but we work it 57 different ways." Yes; there is only one kind of socialism, the kind that robs man of initiative, the kind that says, "property is robbery," the kind that pronounces "rent, interest, and profit theft," the kind that harbors and pampers the lazy, the incompetent, the criminal; the kind that condemns thrift and self-sacrifice, and damns capital; the kind that proclaims its cause not a question of right but might,

"because we have the numbers"; that kind that gains recruits by fanning the flames of discontent; the kind that works woman suffrage as the right bower in winning its game; the kind that scorns patriotism and tears down our flag and tramples it in the dust; the kind that could abolish our Constitution, destroy our homes, and rob us of our faith and hope; the kind that would make the State paternal; the kind that would bring the cooperative commonwealth. This cruel thing that I have tried to bring forcibly before you is the only kind of socialism. "But we work 57 different ways," he said. Yes; they work it the revolutionary way, like the I. W. W., and seek to bring the cooperative commonwealth by force, by strikes, by syndicalism, ultimately by the general strike or a revolution.

Had you have become intimately acquainted with socialism and woman suffrage, not only by reading but by listening to talks and lectures for three years, or say even for three months—I say had you attended suffragist and socialist lectures in parlor, schoolhouse, woman's club, church, theater, hall, labor temple, hobo mission, I. W. W. hang outs, and on the street corners, you would pronounce woman suffrage the daughter of socialism—at least you would acknowledge them twin sisters, because you would have found them ever walking hand in hand. Both work on the sympathies of a kind, well-meaning, thoughtless, unsuspecting, and ignorant public. Last August crowds on Washington's street corners were told by one fair suffragist, talking for suffrage, of a hairbrush factory where women were employed to insert bristles in the brushes. The women finding that their eyesight was being impaired by the work, stopped it, and the capitalist then employed the little children to do the work. "Were the children employed there the children of the women who had formerly worked in the factory?" was asked by an inquisitive listener. "Yes," said the speaker. "And would you give the ballot to these cruel women, who, suffering from this work, allowed their little children to go and do it in their places?" was then asked. The only response was an appreciative laugh from the crowd. This well-meaning public was told by a socialist, at the corner of Thirty-fifth Street and Broadway, New York, "1,000,000 little children are starving on the East Side, due to capitalism." Hundreds of statements just as overdrawn, just as false, and just as startling are poured into the ears of crowds by a thousand socialists and suffragist speakers every day. If men and women would give time to listening to suffragists and socialists, and having listened, would investigate what they said, and, having investigated, would publish the truth of their investigations, we would not now have this sly, creeping, cruel creature gnawing at the very vitals of our Republic. The working of socialism and suffrage proceeded so slyly and stealthily in England that they had gained a mighty hold before their power was recognized. We, too, sleep. Ambassador Bryce, in a final talk before he left our shores, spoke of our Constitution as the greatest thing ever penned, and doubtless depressed by the lowering clouds hanging over his own beloved country, warned us never to alter it. Would it not be wise to ponder well the import of his words of warning?

Since the suffragists caused me through the press to be reported lost (not to be found); since the news of my second appearance before the Rules Committee of the House was seemingly suppressed by all Washington papers, also by the Associated Press, I would ask

the Rules Committee to kindly allow the following, which appeared with some errors in the Washington Post, and which still remains unanswered, to be printed as an addendum to what I said before them.

I know something about woman suffrage. As secretary of the California Political Equality League, the largest suffrage organization in California; also as secretary of the College Equal Suffrage League, and in many other capacities I gave one year of my life working for suffrage, and I would here state that my work was all done without remuneration, while many of the "ardent" workers got pay, or at least their expenses, just as they are getting it everywhere to-day. I mention this matter of pay simply to show you that "I worked for the cause." I was one of those poor, deluded ones, who knew nothing about it, and I was urged into it by club women, who said I could do so much good and that it was my duty.

As a member of 10 clubs and organizations and press chairman for southern California for the State Federation of Women's Clubs, also as registrar, precinct captain, worker at headquarters and at the polls, I had more than ordinary opportunity to observe and watch the workings of suffrage. I considered the workings of suffrage in California so unsatisfactory, so disappointing, so disastrous, that last summer I came to Washington to tell about it. I felt I was in a measure instrumental in bringing suffrage in that grand, glorious State and I wanted to say that, if I had it to do over again, I would work twice as hard, if that were possible, against it.

When the object of my visit to Washington was made known in California, the suffragists set up a great howl, and through the press they pronounced me insane and threatened my return to my dear California.

I had intended to go to the Scandinavian countries, to England, to New Zealand, and Australia to study conditions and the suffrage question in those lands that I might get the facts first hand, but when I heard of the threats from the California suffragists I considered it my duty to postpone that trip and return to Washington, and, if possible, appear again before the Rules Committee of the House to emphasize the points I had previously brought out. I came. I reiterated my former sweeping assertions. I emphasized them. And now I want to ask why, if suffrage has been a success in California; why, if my statements are not true, did not the suffragists bring out the facts and face me there before the committee with those facts?

They had representatives there from Alabama, from Louisiana, from Kentucky, from Virginia, where suffrage has not been granted, and where, I pray to God, it will never be; they had representatives there from Utah and Wyoming, where women vote; they had representatives there from Illinois, where the franchise has been granted, but where women have not yet voted—representatives from all these States and more spoke before this committee.

Now come the "whys." Please give attention. Why, after the statements I made, did not our distinguished citizen of California, Mr. John H. Braly (one-time president of the league of which I was secretary), who came across the country to attend this hearing, say something to refute my assertions? Mr. Braly for two days and a half—Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday morning—was an interested listener. He came during the meetings and had several talks with me and tried to argue to bring me back into the suffrage ranks. As a last argument he asked, "But, Miss Bock, you would not wish to have your vote taken from you?" I replied, "I would like to lose that vote to-morrow, and would be glad to go from house to house circulating a petition that would help to take it away from me." When Mr. Braly was called by the suffragist chairman Friday afternoon to say a word he was not present. Mr. Braly is an old gentleman of fine and imposing presence who gave much money and made many talks for suffrage through California. Why did he not refute my words? When his name was called, the only response that came was silence.

I saw a yellow badge bearing the word "delegate" pinned to the lapel of the coat of Mrs. Wolf, who ran for the board of education on the Socialist ticket last June in Los Angeles. Mrs. Wolf is a well-informed, clever woman, who belongs to several clubs and is always on her feet when occasion presents. Why did she not refute my statements?

I saw there Miss Wills, wealthy and cultured club woman of Los Angeles, one who has espoused the cause of suffrage for years. Why did she not refute my statements instead of sitting quietly by?

There was also Miss Anthony, of Los Angeles, a relative of Susan B. Anthony. Why did she not refute my words instead of looking into space?

I saw there Mrs. Wells, the little Los Angeles policewoman, whom everybody likes. She did not take her "club" to me, but rushed up and gave me the "glad hand."

Congressman Raker, of California, with great force urged that a suffrage committee be appointed in the House. He did not take up my statements and refute them.

I wonder if the sweet wife of that California Congressman would have so graciously given her time to Miss Helen Todd (formerly factory inspector in Chicago, and who, I believe, might be found on investigation to be at present a paid worker in the suffrage or some allied cause), had she been able to refute my words?

Let me ask what does Miss Alice Blackwell, of Boston, Mass., who gave most of the rebuttal testimony, know of the practical workings of suffrage in California?

Mr. James Lees Laidlaw, of New York—notice, please, gentlemen, of New York—came before you, and, in a voice that was meant to convince everyone, he attempted to squelch me and forever settle the question of suffrage in California by reading a letter from Senator Works, in which our good Senator denied the truth of the quotation I used concerning him. Why did not the Senator just step over himself and tell us all about it?

I am a charter member of the Women's City Club of Los Angeles, before which, on November 3, Senator John D. Works is reported by the New York Sun to have said: "The women in California, taken in the mass, have made a failure of suffrage. How many voted in the last election? The women who go to club meetings and hear public questions discussed probably did, but they are only a small number. The other women did not vote." This quotation I brought into my talk before the Rules Committee of the House on Thursday. I was told afterwards that Senator Works had denied this statement. Had I then been aware of Senator Works's denial, I might not have used the quotation from the Sun. Regarding this, however, I wish to ask if there had been nothing in the telegram to the Sun, would the Los Angeles Times have printed in its issue of November 4 the following:

SCORES THEM IN THEIR LAIR—SENATOR HITS WOMEN'S CITY CLUB WITH FIGURES—SUGGESTS TAXING THEM FOR FAILING TO VOTE.

"Immigration and citizenship" was the double-headed topic of an address given yesterday by Senator Works before the Women's City Club. He gave full measure pressed down and running over. * * *

Going on to the second subject of "citizenship," Senator Works declared that the women of California have not come up to the mark in respect to using the privilege of suffrage.

"Has suffrage been successful in California?" he asked. There was a momentary, breathless pause, and a woman's voice somewhere in the rear of the room piped up, "Yes."

"I must tell you the truth," continued the Senator. "No; the women of California, taken in the mass, are not doing their duty in respect to voting. How many women went to the polls and voted at the last election do you think?"

The women squirmed uneasily in their seats at this point-blank get-down-to-figures question hurled at them.

"Give us time, Senator, give us time," pleaded a woman in the front row. "It's so new yet, you see, and—"

"Time? You've had time enough," sternly replied the Senator, "plenty of it; and yet statistics show that at the last city election only about 43 per cent of the women of Los Angeles voted."

A shudder and a sigh passed simultaneously over the feminine audience.

"That's not a good showing," continued the Senator mercilessly; "you ought to do better than that. Understand, I'm not lecturing you, ladies; I'm simply appealing to you as good citizens to do your duty."

"How can we make the women vote?" asked Mrs. Cora Lewis.

"That's a pretty hard thing to do," admitted the Senator. "I think one way might be effective to tax them, say, 10 per cent for not voting."

The Los Angeles Herald of November 4, in its report of the matter, said in part: "Women as a whole are failing in their duties as citizens. Senator

Works declared, when discussing this: 'In this respect equal suffrage is a failure in California as long as we consider that we are doing well when 50 per cent of the registered voters go to the polls. When it is seen that only 45 per cent of the women went to the polls at the last election, then you can not say that woman suffrage is a success.'

This paper also printed the following interview, which, because of length, I only give in part: "Ha! ha! That's funny! Why, the very proof of our success lies in the fact that men like Senator Works, who want women to vote for them, speak and speak to make us think as they do."—Mrs. Lobingier.

Don't worry; let them knock. They've knocked suffrage in Colorado, but that didn't stop women voting. Suffrage's success lies in the fact that we have the ballot and can use it or not.—Miss Mary Foy.

Such a statement is very poor politics for Senator Works, but beyond that I can not see how it would affect anything—certainly it couldn't affect suffrage.—Mrs. H. H. Rose.

In the Los Angeles Times of November 7 Mrs. Hortense M. Foster, 143 Crescent Avenue, Los Angeles, under the caption "A women lectures women," said in part: "It would be pathetic, indeed, were it not so ridiculous, that the recent frank statement of Senator Works as to the neglect of citizenship by the women voters of California should arouse the local suffrage leaders to a hysterical outbreak of abuse and evasion. For one, I commend the Senator for daring to call attention to indisputable facts and figures, which are backed up by data and registration lists, which, instead of calling forth insulting epigrams, evasive and venomous, should receive the earnest and vigilant attention and consideration of all patriotic women."

I leave these things for a thoughtful, discriminating, just committee to consider.

One thing more, please, and I have done for now.

Colorado has had suffrage for over 20 years. It was reported that 600 suffrage delegates came from the different States. Where was Colorado? Why was she not there before the Rules Committee represented by at least a dozen of her leading women citizens telling of the great reform woman suffrage had brought?

Senator Helen Ring Robinson, of Colorado, I understand, has been spending some weeks in the East talking on woman suffrage. I did not hear her plead before the Rules Committee of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will take a recess now until 2.30 o'clock this afternoon.

AFTER RECESS.

The committee met at 2.30 o'clock p. m., pursuant to the taking of recess.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mrs. Dodge, you may proceed now. I would like to have you finish your side in an hour if you possibly can, inasmuch as there are several who wish to make short replies. The committee is willing to go along until 5 o'clock, but to-morrow some of us have engagements that will keep us from being here, and we would like to finish this afternoon.

Mrs. DODGE. Mr. Chairman, I have it in writing that you will hear the National Association all of to-day, including the afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Well, you have already had as much time now as those on the other side.

Mrs. DODGE. That was not the question, I beg your pardon; but you said that the suffragists would probably take a day and we could take a day, and I have it in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. We will give you all of this afternoon except one hour. We will give you until 4 o'clock.

Mrs. DODGE. That will cut out about six of our speakers.

I would like to reiterate what I said this morning. It has been hinted that we are not speaking to the resolution before your committee, and I will simply repeat what I said, that it was intimated to us that the committee wanted to hear the general arguments from our side, and we are putting the arguments forward as was requested by the Committee on Rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be glad for you to go into every phase of the suffrage question from every standpoint and angle.

Mrs. DODGE. That is what was intimated, but I do not believe we can do it in so short a time.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had all the morning, and you went into a good many phases of it.

Mrs. DODGE. We will do the best we can. The first speaker this afternoon is Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, general secretary of the New Jersey association.

STATEMENT OF MRS. O. D. OLIPHANT.

Mrs. OLIPHANT. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, ladies and gentlemen:

After the adjournment this morning I heard a young lady wearing a yellow badge remark that the working of the anti mind was peculiar. I am glad to know that the suffragists admit that the antis have a mind, and, moreover, that it is working.

The New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage is just 19 months old, and in that short space of time we have over 8,000 members 21 years of age or over, and we are increasing our membership by hundreds weekly. In spite of the fact that we are accused of being a millionaire corporation, 90 per cent of our members are wage earners; by wage earners I mean women engaged in gainful pursuits—business women, factory girls, trained nurses, doctors, lawyers, musicians, school-teachers, stenographers, etc. The women who lead in this movement in New Jersey are the same women who lead in all charitable and philanthropic work throughout the State. In New Jersey the suffragists have been organized 23 years. Their last figure of membership, given out this week, is 7,000, and it is perfectly safe to say that a large proportion are under age. In fact, many of them have not even heard of suffrage, for they are peacefully slumbering in their cradles.

The growth of our movement in New Jersey is a fair illustration of what has been happening in all the States that are opposing woman suffrage. May I cite a personal illustration to show how eagerly the women of the country grasp the opportunity to show where they stand on this question. Last April another member of our association and myself went to Elizabeth, N. J., to see if we could form a branch organization there. We met, by appointment, three ladies, and they said, "We are afraid it is impossible to organize in Elizabeth; the suffragists have held two meetings, and we think everybody must be for equal suffrage." We asked if they would not call up some of their friends on the telephone and try to arrange a meeting in two weeks. They said to us they would not dare to engage a hall for fear nobody would come to a meeting, so we suggested that they hold it in a private house. The day of the meeting the house, although a large one, was

not big enough to hold the crowd of women that came to that meeting. Miss Bronson, of New York, addressed the meeting, and Elizabeth organized that day with 139 charter members. To-day Elizabeth's membership is 1,132. Elizabeth's history is being repeated all over the country to-day, for as soon as the women of the country realize the situation they are glad to come out and show where they stand on this question.

I feel I can speak with authority in regard to the sentiment on votes for women in New Jersey, for since the 1st of last July I have spoken not only in a number of cities, but before many of the granges in every county of our State but one, and I shall speak in that county during this month.

Last winter the suffragists in New Jersey made the claim that all the grangers were for woman suffrage. I had been speaking on an average to four grange meetings a week, including grange picnics, where the audiences have ranged from 25 to over 800, and I had found the vast majority of grangers, both men and women, unalterably opposed to woman suffrage. In fact, the percentage of those who were in favor of woman suffrage is ridiculously small, and their ranks have been even further depleted since the grangers have realized that equal suffrage means the doubling of the foreign vote, and that it is the forerunner of the socialistic principles that aim to place the red flag above the red, white, and blue.

In voicing the protests of the women of New Jersey I feel that I occupy rather an unique position, for I believe that New Jersey is the only State represented here to-day that has repudiated woman suffrage after a 25 years' experiment. That is a fact, that not only this committee but Congress should consider carefully, and New Jersey's action should be respected and ratified.

The women of New Jersey had practical evidence this summer of the sort of justice they may expect from the suffragists. The New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage maintain their State headquarters at Trenton. We occupy a building there loaned to us by one of our members. In July four suffragists, national leaders, came to Trenton. They were on their way to Washington at the time, but decided to stop and hold a meeting at Trenton, so they secured permission from the chief of police to hold a meeting on one of our prominent corners. We have a number of prominent corners in Trenton, but where do you suppose these national leaders, who hope some day to be political leaders, chose for their meeting? The premises of the New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. They held a meeting for over an hour. They called the women opposed to them liars, pikers, and parasites, language that does not indicate sobriety of thought or womanly achievement. Many of the men who stood among the listeners said, "Well, this is the limit. You never see men going to the headquarters of the opposition to hold a meeting. If women begin campaigning like this before they get the vote, what will they do in an exciting political campaign?" Those suffragists, in flights of oratory, were saying that they want the vote to protect woman; but their actions plainly nullified their oratory, for there they were brazenly usurping the rights of women honestly and legitimately opposed to them. To say the least, they put their heel on the American spirit of fair play.

Mrs. DODGE. Mr. Chairman, we are trying to cut down a little and, although Mrs. Oliphant has quite a good deal in her paper, she has not presented it all.

The CHAIRMAN. I have been conferring with some members of the committee for a moment, and if you insist on having the whole day it may be some members of the committee may come to-morrow and hear those in rebuttal, but all of us can not be here. The committee would like to conclude the hearing, and if you can possibly do so, Mrs. Dodge, by 4 o'clock or even 4.30, that would give an hour to the others this afternoon.

Mrs. DODGE. I am perfectly willing to accede as far as possible to the wishes of the Committee on Rules, but I shall have to repeat again that we had the promise of the whole day and we brought our speakers here accordingly—some from a great distance. I also asked if there would be rebuttal, and I was told, by Mr. Henry, that it would be the next day, and that we should have a chance to reply.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought we could arrange it that way, and yesterday morning we finished and could have given you yesterday afternoon, if you had been there.

Mrs. DODGE. We knew nothing about that.

The CHAIRMAN. I presumed you would be here when the hearing began. You could have had yesterday afternoon and all day to-day.

Mrs. DODGE. We shall do the best we can.

The CHAIRMAN. Those things frequently occur and we have to adjust ourselves to them. If you can conclude in time to give them time for rebuttal to-day, we should be glad to have you do so.

Mrs. DODGE. I realize and appreciate your courtesy in giving us so much time, Mr. Chairman, and I am only sorry I have made the program so long.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course it is practically the whole day you are getting, anyhow.

Mrs. McCULLOUGH. I think that we would be satisfied with an hour, Mr. Chairman, if we could have that.

Mrs. DODGE. All I can say, of course, is what I have said before—and I regret that I must keep on saying it to the chairman of the committee—that we were promised all the day.

The CHAIRMAN. True, I promised you the whole day; but still, you are falling short only an hour. We will sit another day next week and go ahead for another day, if you like.

Mrs. DODGE. Oh, no, Mr. Henry; I think that is too much. I think you have had enough already.

Mr. PARR. This is largely a question of printing, anyhow. I think you will find that there will be as many members of the committee here to-morrow as there are now, if notice were sent out.

Mrs. McCULLOUGH. They will not have an opportunity to present their views to the committee.

Mr. PARR. There is nothing in that. It will all be printed.

Mrs. McCULLOUGH. We would like very much to finish to-day.

Mrs. DODGE. If the suffragists have any rebuttal, Mr. Chairman, we will have a chance to reply, I suppose?

The CHAIRMAN. If any new matter is sprung on you, I suppose that would be in accordance with legal procedure.

Mrs. DODGE. May I proceed?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; go ahead.

Mrs. DODGE. The next speaker is Miss Alice Edith Abell, who is president of the Wage Earners' Anti-Suffrage League of New York.

STATEMENT OF MISS ALICE EDITH ABELL, PRESIDENT WAGE EARNERS' ANTI-SUFFRAGE LEAGUE OF NEW YORK.

Miss ABELL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am not a speaker. I am a stenographer, and my business is to listen; but I have a few words I would like to say on this subject.

Some are born to the ballot, some achieve the ballot, and some have the ballot thrust upon them. You gentlemen belong in the first class; our suffragist sisters are trying to get into the second class and to put us in the third.

Now, we of the Wage Earners' Anti-Suffrage League are not doubting women of the chimney corner, as Mrs. Blatch has termed those who do not agree with her. We have convictions on this question based on our experience in man's world, the business world, and we know that the ballot would be a disadvantage to us. I myself bear testimony to the fact that the ballot has no relation to wages whatever, having started my career at \$4 a week and worked up to \$24 a week. We wage earners think we have not lost our feminine distinctiveness, and in fact have, many of us, sneaking aspirations toward the chimney corner, although we have been obliged to assume some masculine responsibilities. We can the better appreciate what woman's true sphere in life is, having been kept out of it daily.

Viewing the home from the outside standpoint of the business world, we can see what it should supply to properly equip its members for their various services in the world and the need to maintain in it a restful atmosphere, which will afford a relief from the turmoil of outside activities. We know that masculine occupations are incompatible with true home making, and that the introduction of party politics into the home, through the enfranchisement of its manager and arbiter, must disturb its tranquillity. This does not mean we believe that women should not take any interest in national and civic affairs, for the affectional quality of mind which characterizes the majority of our sex is useful in government when combined with the rational mentality which is characteristic of the majority of your sex. But feminine perception of ideals in government should, we believe, be ultimated by masculine judgment and practical experience in the enactment and enforcement of good laws. Moreover, the successful home maker leaves her stamp on the nation and on civilization in the statesmen of her posterity, which reaches wider and further into the future physically, morally, and psychologically than mere individual feminist achievement. We hear so much from our suffragist sisters about the sweetness of freedom and of economic independence and the need for the emancipation of women from slavery. Do we not all have to submit to the authority of employers in business, of political superiors in politics, and the laws of country and of nature? And do not the laws of our feminine nature protest against our undertaking to duplicate man's work, in addition to performing our own, which man can not assume? We,

who realize this, wish to be left unhampered by political restrictions and obligations, to develop our various fields of endeavor by feminine methods.

Therefore we ask on our own behalf and on behalf of our less-experienced sisters in men's activities that you weigh carefully the encouragement of the woman suffragists, which would result from the establishing of a committee at their request.

They, by their own figures, are a minority of the women in the country. I will mention that about 75 per cent of the women employees in the corporation for which I work are either opposed or indifferent to the vote, and I know of but 5 per cent who are avowed suffragists. The strongest argument of the suffragists is their most feminine one—and it is also the strongest argument of the antisuffragists—namely, what women want. On this basis the majority of men will decide the suffrage question, and they should be guided in their decision by the will of the majority of those to be directly affected by their action. If it can actually be proven that the majority of women want the ballot, the Wage Earners' Anti-Suffrage League is ready to show its democratic spirit by accepting the added responsibilities which go with it, so far as their physical limitations permit, just as they have accepted other responsibilities outside of their own sphere, when necessary.

Mrs. DODGE. The next speaker is Miss Alice Buck, of Trenton, N. J., who is also a wage earner.

STATEMENT OF MISS ALICE BUCK, TRENTON, N. J.

Miss BUCK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, for the past nine years I have been out in the world earning my own living and even before then I worked during my summer vacations, consequently most of my associates are working girls, but I do not know of one of them who is a suffragist. My most intimate girl friend is forelady in a factory in Trenton, in which there are about 60 girls employed, but they are also opposed to suffrage.

A certain suffragist in Trenton says that most of the working girls are too ignorant to know what they want. The majority of working girls of to-day are not ignorant. Educational advantages have improved so much within the past few years that it is possible for the average working girl to acquire a fairly good education. We know what we want and most of us have very good reasons. We do not want the vote, principally because we feel that we have quite enough to occupy our time now, regardless of politics. The average factory girl is away from her home about 12 hours of the day. This leaves her very little time for anything else.

The suffragists claim that when women are given the right to vote it will increase the working girl's salary. How can it? In most cases the girls are employed by men, therefore it is up to the men to increase the working girl's salary. Women very rarely employ girls, except in the capacity of domestics. In fact, the day that the working girl's salary is increased to equal that of the working man, a great majority of the working girls will lose their positions. There are numberless business firms that could not afford to keep the same number of employees and increase their wages to any great extent.

Therefore, if compelled to increase the wage by law, they will have to discharge some of the girls to cut down expenses. In a number of instances this will necessitate one girl having to do the work of three or four, and to a majority of the girls who are not physically strong this will mean a general breakdown of health.

There are very few girls who have the endurance of a man. Would it not, therefore, be a better plan of reform to increase the working-man's salary, thus enabling him to marry and support a family, and in this way prevent the ruin of so many unmarried girls. There are hundreds of young men who would be only too glad to have a home of their own could they but afford it.

I do not deny that an increase of salary for most working girls would be a very good thing; but an equal wage, never.

The suffragists say that a great many men do not make good politicians because they are so easily bribed, and that the women could not be bribed. I believe that there are just as many women as men who would be easy victims of bribery. How many women even now are living disreputable lives simply to be able to buy the pretty things that every woman loves so much and otherwise could not afford to buy? Therefore on election day a great many women would sell their votes for the price of a pretty little article of wearing apparel.

Most of the suffragists seem to be women who are simply thirsting for publicity and notoriety. They are continually doing things to make themselves conspicuous.

At a hearing before the New Jersey Legislature last winter I heard Dr. Anna Howard Shaw say that her one aim in life had always been to be a policeman. [Laughter.] Most of the working girls whom I know have a higher aim in life than to want to be a policeman.

Men have been heard to remark that when women get the vote they will not even deign to offer a lady who is standing in a trolley car a seat; others that they will discontinue to raise their hats when greeting them; and some, who are husbands and fathers, even say that they will cease to support their families—that if the women vote they should support themselves. Under such conditions what courtesy could we working girls expect from our employers? These very facts make it evident that when women get equal suffrage they will never be able to again command the respect and consideration of men as they have heretofore. That is about all a poor working girl can command, and I expect to retain that privilege just as long as possible.

Mrs. DODGE. We have a letter from Mrs. Elizabeth McCracken, a well-known writer and honorary vice president of the Massachusetts State Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, which will be read by Mrs. John Balsh, who is on the executive committee.

Mrs. BALSH. Mrs. McCracken says:

I wish that I might be with you on that significant occasion, the results of which I shall await with profound interest.

It seems to me that we can not make too plain the important fact that our position as antisuffragists is not negative but positive. We are not so much opposing the policy of the suffragists as we are presenting a policy of our own. The suffragists have one conception of the relation of women to good government, and we antisuffragists have another which seems to us better.

It has sometimes been said of the antisuffragists that they shrink from civic responsibilities and activities. I think it can not be too clearly said that this

is not the case. In Massachusetts, at least, the women who are especially active and effectual in civic affairs are strong antisuffragists. Indeed, their very experience as civic workers has led them to a belief in antisuffrage; they have been forced to see that in the important work they are doing the ballot would be not only not a help but an actual hindrance. They have a very positive reason for opposing votes for women.

The ballot does not seem to us, as it does to some of our suffragist friends, an inherent right; we regard it as a political expedient, designed for the use of men, and adapted only to the use of men. We desire to do our duty to our State and to our country not by bending to our use the tools of men, but by employing tools designed for women and adapted to the use of women.

Just as fervently as the suffragists do the antisuffragists desire to be citizens, and intend to be citizens, though they do not desire nor, if it can be avoided, intend to be voters. The suffragists affirm that they can not be citizens until they receive the ballot. We antisuffragists feel that we not only can be and are citizens without the ballot but that we shall remain better citizens without it than with it.

This is but a very brief and, I fear, inadequate statement of my conviction on this vital subject, but I nevertheless can not refrain from making it at this significant time.

Mrs. DODGE. I am sorry that some of the speakers can not be heard, but you know that is not our fault; it is because we are women and our voices are not strong. I do not think that there are more than five or six of us who can be heard in a theater that will hold 2,500 people, and that is one reason why women would not make good campaign speakers in a political campaign. It is very good to say a good thing, but if you can not be heard what is the use?

Next I have to introduce Miss Ella C. Bréhaut, of the District of Columbia, and vice president of the District of Columbia Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

STATEMENT OF MISS ELLA C. BRÉHAUT, VICE PRESIDENT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Miss BRÉHAUT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, the demand by the suffragists for absolute equality is rarely made in good faith. The Woman's Journal has said:

Women must be united to do away with privilege in every form. Only when privilege has been rooted out will women have attained the equality with men, and only then will all working women understand their rightful positions.

It is true, gentlemen, that as a sex we have privileges. When a man in business life is assigned a task that is physically hard the woman worker does not envy him. Even a suffragist believes in an eight-hour law for women and many of them demand a minimum wage. These provisions of law are designed to make men and women unequal. The antisuffragists desire inequalities in the industrial world. If a man and a woman are equally qualified to fill one place the man should be preferred to the woman, who does not have to work, and he should be preferred to the woman who has to support only herself. The laws in force in a number of the States limiting the hours of labor in which women may be employed take away her right to work as long as she will, and help us to forget the evil day when she was permitted to ruin her health by competing with men in this regard. In many occupations woman should be willing to do a

smaller stint of work and receive a proportionate wage. It is better for her health and the health of future generations to have it so.

The body of industrial women is a shifting body. A woman is wage earner for a few years and then gives up her wage-earning employment to begin her real life work as wife and mother, in which life she shares with her husband whatever he may achieve or inherit, the fruits of his success or failure. A large percentage of all women marry. The expectation of marriage lessens a woman's ambition in a gainful occupation, and this lack of ambition can have no other effect than to limit her efficiency.

The suffragists claim that woman's low wage is due to her having no vote. On the contrary, lack of skill is one of the reasons, and one that can be overcome in time by industrial education, technical and trade instruction, given in the public schools or in cooperation with them. This instruction is still in its infancy, but a good beginning has been made, and if our boards of education move with even ordinary speed and intelligence we may hope, even in a democratic country like ours, to turn out boys and girls from the cooperative industrial schools who shall be comparable with those trained in the schools of Germany, a country in which men are not politically equal, but where a system of plural voting still obtains. Increasing intelligence as to the necessity for trade training for women does not depend upon woman suffrage. Each community must settle the matter in accordance with its peculiar circumstances.

The industrial woman also suffers from the opposition of men's unions. What is her remedy? To vote for some one who may or may not do anything to help her? Not at all; let her rather have a union of her own. If there were solidarity among the women stenographers in this National Capital, men in the legal profession would not be boasting of never paying more than \$7 a week for stenographic work. A union girl would demand the union wage, and men would not be beggared by paying it.

Much has resulted from the solidarity of men and women in the garment trades.

I read in the Survey of March 8 that the New York garment-strikes, then just ended, were of national significance. In women's wear the struggle ushered in a plan providing for grievance and arbitration boards, safe and sanitary conditions, minimum wage and minimum age of employees, increase of pay, regulation of hours of labor, and compensation for overtime. Thousands of workers and hundreds of manufacturers are thus brought together in the grievance and sanitary boards to endeavor to put order and health and publicity and responsibility into their common work.

Manufacturers and men alike have imposed certain common standards upon all establishments.

The view of the various employers' associations has been expressed by their attorney, Mr. Julius Henry Cohen, who says:

We have reached a point where the garment manufacturers are doing what the professions have long done. We hold ourselves responsible for the scalawags of our trade. It does not make any difference how good the standards are that a man wants to set in his own plant, the competitor who knows no limits in his treatment of his help undermines them and brings the trade into obloquy. We are going to set the whole level of the trade on a higher plane, and we count on the workers to join with us in doing it; to work things out together.

This is what wage-earning women may do for themselves and without votes.

A suffragist lecturer here in the District of Columbia talks of women as a class bettering their condition by exercising the franchise. Women are not a class; they belong to all classes. I know middle-class women here in Washington who buy 10-cent muslin underwear for their children at the 10-cent stores. I urged one of them to buy only that having the Consumers' League label showing that it is made under proper conditions, but she was not moved to consider the sweated labor of the other women. They are not of her class and her vote would not help the sweatshop toiler. Neither is it to be expected that the votes of the women stockholders in the great industrial corporations (and they constitute 50 per cent in some) would help the cause of the wage earner. If they feel responsibility let them see to it that no dividend comes to them through the insufficiently paid labor of other women. And then, gentlemen, if the home woman will do her part in molding the character of growing children another generation will see no scalawags in any business.

The most impassioned utterances of the suffragists refer to the white-slave traffic. They mean commercialized vice. The anti-suffragists believe that commercialized vice is in a fair way of being destroyed. The testimony of Mr. Henry W. Finch, special commissioner, Department of Justice, before the subcommittee on appropriations in February last shows what a man-made and man-conducted government is doing to suppress this so-called white slavery.

The work of the bureau under his control now covers 18 States. The Government in this matter is undertaking to prevent the interstate and international transportation of women for the purpose of prostitution. Its chief difficulty is to secure evidence. This bureau of the Department of Justice is using local men in the various cities to assist in the work of convicting white slavers. Practically all of them are attorneys of standing. The local man is selected by the special agent of the Federal bureau, and after the plans have been arranged he goes with the special agent to the chief of police and asks for the cooperation of the police department. In 59 cases out of 60 the cooperation is forthcoming. An officer is detailed and the three men then enumerate the houses of ill fame and their inmates. The local attorney is then familiar with the faces of the women, so that he may be in a position to detect a new face and investigate her coming. The proprietors of the houses frequently inform one another, and even the inmates are often unwilling to see young girls forced into the business, and they too assist the white-slave officer. The local agent not only prosecutes the violator of the Mann Act, but as a private citizen offers help in the enforcement of State laws; and this work of assisting the Federal bureau pays an attorney \$20 a month on the average, sometimes only \$5 or \$10. He is interested in the work and frequently sacrifices his personal interests, as the fees are merely nominal. If he is all day in court he receives only \$2.50.

The convictions for violations of the Mann Act number about 350 a year, practically one a day; and so usual is the news regarding them that I noticed lately that a report of the conviction of five men, with fines from \$100 to \$800, took 1 inch of space in the last page of the newspaper.

Mr. Finch says that to enforce the law in every case there must be a closer coordination between Federal and State laws. This we are coming to. A majority of the States have started to get the laws necessary. When they have been gotten, the complete suppression of the white-slave traffic will be attained. I am quoting Mr. Finch. His bureau has started to organize in each city a public-welfare association composed of church societies. All denominations have entered into the work. Last winter associations had been formed in 260 cities, and we expect to have such associations in 500 cities before long.

After a girl is rescued she is given work to do, generally clerical work. When the plan is extended some of them will be employed as domestics in a boarding house established for their housing.

Every girl put to work is paid from \$35 to \$60 a month. This enables her to clothe herself and pay her board, furnished at cost. A woman friend is assigned to each girl for the purpose of visiting her at her office or boarding house and keep in touch with her.

Women's votes in this matter can not do as much as preventive educational work.

Many women are cooperating in the Federal and State work that I have outlined, and the antisuffragists believe that the Committee on Appropriations will continue to do its part in furnishing the sinews of this war on commercialized vice, and without a female constituency. We are not such impractical idealists as to suppose that any government can abolish this ancient vice by passing a law. Ideals of life and conduct are not raised in that way, and we have yet to hear of girls being saved from a life of vice by votes.

It is claimed by the suffragists that the red-light district in San Francisco was abolished by reason of women having the franchise in California. But the antis have not heard that the Barbary coast red-light district was a campaign issue. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the women's clubs of the city of San Francisco determined that the red-light district should go, and in the usual timeworn way they brought their influence to bear, as hundreds of women's clubs have done for many years, and with marvelous success, in manhood suffrage States. All honor to Mrs. Rolph, of the W. C. T. U., and other organizations that accomplished the enforcement of the law. But it was not done by votes of women or votes of men. A similar work was accomplished in Los Angeles by the Rev. Wiley Phillips and the prosecuting attorney 10 years before women had the vote in California.

Mrs. DODGE. Next is Miss Lucy J. Price, who is the secretary of the Cleveland auxiliary of the Ohio association.

STATEMENT OF MISS LUCY J. PRICE, SECRETARY CLEVELAND AUXILIARY OHIO ASSOCIATION.

Miss PRICE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: After our last hearing the committee were told by the suffragists that our figures were at least unable to be proven, and that many of them practically amounted to nothing. I hope the gentlemen of the committee will see in the record which we have now given new proofs and amplification of our statistics and that all of our figures have been verified and come from competent authorities.

Although we have strayed away from a good many of the early ideals of the people who formed our Government, we yet believe the statement of Mr. Benton, who said that any arguments which are true arguments for or against any law must be based upon the good or evil effects of that law. That is our stand. We believe there are no arguments for or against woman suffrage which shall be taken as true arguments which are not concerned with the good or evil effects of woman suffrage; and we believe that is a thing to be considered.

Miss Jane Addams is reported to have said that the principal reason that they wanted the special committee on suffrage was because the Judiciary Committee was so accustomed to dealing with legalities and laws that it was unable to grasp the fineness of sentiment. We are very glad to be talking to a committee which is accustomed to dealing with legalities and questions of law, because we believe this is such a question, and we believe that the test of this question, as the test of any other legislation, must be whether or not it is going to be good legislation for the country.

I maintain that the efficiency of the electorate will be decreased by granting suffrage to women. There are a great many reasons against it, as you have heard to-day, because of its effect on the family and effect on reforms, but I set forth that the actual efficiency of the electorate will be decreased instead of increased; and that alone should prevent you from taking the first step toward woman suffrage, since you are not willing to take the second step, and if you are not willing to take the second step, it is worse than useless to take the first step in appointing a committee on woman suffrage.

In the first place, you all know very well the way that the ignorant vote is handled in the cities. I come from a city which is second in number of immigrants who enter it every year—second in the United States. Cleveland is exceeded in the number of immigrants only by New York City. That is one reason I am particularly interested in this subject. By the ignorant vote I do not necessarily mean the foreign vote; I mean any vote which does not grasp the subject it is voting upon.

The vote which does not understand what it is voting about is an ignorant vote.

In Cleveland the so-called ignorant vote, or foreign vote, is handled, as it is in every other city, by capitalists. One man told me just after our municipal election this year: "I only decided two days before the election whether the 600 men that I vote, would vote for Newton Baker or Harry Davis for mayor."

He votes those 600 men solidly. The ignorant vote is almost always a solid vote, except when it is a Socialist vote, and then it is split from the rest of the vote. Unintelligent women are going to vote just as their husbands tell them to vote, and the intelligent vote is going to be divided. The educated class of women, or intelligent women, are going to vote as they see fit, and their husbands will vote as they see fit. The intelligent vote will be divided on every occasion and the ignorant vote will be solid; voted by one person.

That is one tremendous danger of this increase in the electorate. That is one way in which the efficiency of the electorate is going to be decreased.

Then there is the tremendous menace of the indifferent vote. You know that when the small minority of any electorate votes it often means that it is the portion of the vote which should not vote; it means that the people who vote, where there are only a few, are the people who have a personal grievance or a personal gain; they are the people who have something for or against an administration personally. We have had that proven every time we vote on the school question in Cleveland. A school teacher said to me, "I wish you knew how we who are teaching and working for the Cleveland school board wish the women did not vote, because when the minority votes, those who do vote have something to gain or something to lose; their children are not passed in school, or they want the personal friend promoted."

That is inevitably true when a very small portion of the electorate votes, as is the case where women vote.

In Cleveland less than 5 per cent of the women voted three years ago when there were three women candidates for membership on the school board.

At the election of November 11, 1913, in San Francisco, only one-fourth of the votes were cast by women. Forty-nine thousand eight hundred and thirty-three women registered and 19,678 women voted. In three precincts no women voted. In 49 of the 673 precincts there was an average of less than 10 women per precinct. And this is an analysis of the voting by registrar of elections.

That is one city where the indifference of the women's voting is proven. The minority that votes is not the desirable type of woman; it is not the women who stand for everything that women should stand for; it is not the sane, balanced woman, because those women are unprejudiced, and consequently when women are not sufficiently interested in voting they do not vote, but stay at home.

That is one other way in which the efficiency of the electorate is going to be decreased by women voting.

Without meaning to be unkind to my opponents, I am going to say that I have seen that same ignorance, meaning that they do not understand what they are voting about, on the part of the suffragist leaders—and those suffragist leaders are going to be political leaders if you grant women the vote.

I had a debate in Kentucky last winter with one of the very brilliant leaders of the suffragist society, who said, among other things, that it was urged that women should not be given the vote because they do not understand the questions of government, of finance, and economics. She then referred to the tariff. She said the tariff seemed a perfectly simple thing: "All you have to do is to get the unanimous opinion of everyone whose interests are concerned in the tariff and vote that way." It is perfectly simple.

Last month I had a debate with a suffragist in Newark, Ohio, who said: "It is a disgrace to Ohio that the Greenland child labor bill should be held up while the courts decided whether or not it is constitutional. What difference does it make whether it is constitutional or not?"

These women are suffrage leaders. The last woman I spoke of has her picture in the papers, and she is heralded as the most brilliant, and, I must add, the most dramatic—which is a special attribute in

dealing with the suffrage question—the most dramatic and most brilliant speaker on the suffrage question in Ohio. And she is going to be an absolute power in Ohio politics if women are granted the vote there. We defeated it by 88,000 a year ago, and the suffragists are now considering postponing the initiative election which was to be held in November, because of the poor response to their petitions because of that 88,000 defeat against suffrage. They are afraid they can not get enough names to the petition, and Ohio is a most liberal State in that regard, as they only have to have 8 per cent to have an initiative election. But because they are afraid they can not have enough names, they are going to postpone having the election till next summer, and yet the suffragists say that Kansas, or Colorado, or some other State, has helped to make us favor woman suffrage; that our great port of entry must suffer from that double ignorant vote—the emigrant vote; that we must follow the leadership of women who think our Constitution amounts to nothing at all; that we must have woman suffrage because parts of the country, where conditions are absolutely different, decide we shall have it.

And, gentlemen, we do not think you have any right to do that. We do not think you have any right to force suffrage on a State which defeated it, as Ohio did last year, and we do not think the Representatives or Senators of any State have a right to deal from a long distance with the problems which we know best how to deal with because they are right at hand, and to thrust upon us something which we do not want. And so, because we do not think you have that right, and because there is no use in taking the first step, as I said, toward suffrage if you are not going to take the second step, and because we believe a law ought to be passed wholly on the consideration of whether or not it is going to have a good or evil effect, we ask you not to appoint a special suffrage committee.

I thank you.

Mrs. DODGE. I have had to rearrange the program a little. Miss Julia Morgan Harding, who is president of the Pittsburgh Association Opposing Woman Suffrage, will speak next.

STATEMENT OF MISS JULIA MORGAN HARDING, PRESIDENT PITTSBURGH ASSOCIATION OPPOSING WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Miss HARDING. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, ladies and gentlemen. I represent more than Pittsburgh. I represent a vast majority of the women in what Mr. Lincoln used to call the great State of Allegheny. For them I rise to protest against any amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would give the franchise to women. I here register a protest against the infliction of such a responsibility upon the great majority of the American women who are opposed to woman suffrage—the unwilling majority. I will only touch upon one point of this many-sided question, leaving the economic and industrial conditions, which are so important in my district, to other speakers who will follow me.

The history of the nineteenth century is the history of the gradual extension of the franchise, a fact that no one will controvert. But there is another and parallel fact equally incontrovertible. In proportion as the franchise has been extended it has been disregarded, neglected, unused.

The silent vote has become a menace to democracy and to civilization. Do you think that women will value the privilege of the ballot more than men? Reliable testimony given wherever women vote has shown that they do not, and successive elections show a continuous diminution in the number of women who go to the polls. After the last presidential election the New York papers gave statistics showing that Mr. Wilson was elected President of the United States by a vote that was smaller than Mr. Bryan's when he was defeated.

In the last election in San Francisco only 49,833 women registered, and out of this number but 19,678 took the trouble to go to the polls. In one precinct not one woman voted out of the number registered, and in many precincts less than an average of 10 voted. What do these facts mean? What is called the silent vote is a disturbing politico-social phenomenon that has made some wise thinkers ask themselves if government by representative democracy is a failure. Do you think that it is? Do you think so badly of the way you have managed or mismanaged public affairs and social conditions that you want women to show you how to do better? If you do, why not give it up altogether and give women, single handed, a chance? There would at least be some amusement in that.

My suffrage friends have told me that I show less intelligence than an Iroquois Indian, for they thought so highly of the political ability of women that they admitted squaws to leadership in their councils. I happen to know a little of American ethnology, and I will remind you that when the Iroquois conquered the Delawares they made the Delaware men wear petticoats, called them women, and despised them. And it was that enforced disgrace that made it possible for the early settlers to exist at all during the first days of the colony of Pennsylvania.

To what may you men not be opening the doors? We believe and we know that dropping a piece of paper in a box is not all of voting. Organization is absolutely necessary in party government, and, as Mr. Brice has so clearly told us, organized political parties are necessary in a democracy. Women will have to organize, either separately or with men, unless the men have all been put into petticoats.

We ask you not to trouble existing conditions, remembering that the silent vote, while dangerous and shameful, is not the ignorant vote, and that the ignorant vote plus the silent vote is what will count in the end. [Applause.]

Mrs. DODGE. I wish to introduce Miss Emeline Pitt, of Pittsburgh, who is editor of the Trade Metal Review and formerly was secretary of the Iron City Central Trades Council of Pittsburgh.

STATEMENT OF MISS EMELINE PITT, EDITOR TRADE METAL REVIEW, PITTSBURGH.

MISS EMELINE PITT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: You have heard much on the subject this afternoon in which I am interested, and my remarks will be brief and strictly in the interest of the wage-earning woman, the wage-earning woman whose name has been used to such an extent by the advocates of woman suffrage, and I desire to raise my voice in her interest and in her behalf this afternoon not to have an added burden placed upon her shoulders, already burdened too heavily.

I have been requested to explain the basis of my position. As secretary of the Iron City Central Trades Council, of Pittsburgh, one of the greatest industrial centers of the world, two years and a half as secretary of the Union Labor Committee, of Pittsburgh, twelve years' active service with the trades-union people, I believe has given me ample opportunity for studying in detail the effect woman suffrage would have upon the wage-earning woman.

Many claims have been made that a majority of the wage-earning women are in favor of suffrage. This, I say, is not true. I make this statement authentically, after personal visits to factories, shops, stores of different descriptions, and among the working women.

Glancing out over the situation, I believe it is safe to say that 75 per cent of the wage-earning women to-day are not interested in suffrage. They look upon the question of voting more as a duty they are exempt from than a privilege they are deprived of. Go into the factories, I beg the women who are so strenuously advocating woman suffrage—go out into the highways and by-ways and get facts, and do not be theorists.

I believe that a majority of the women to-day fully respect and have faith in American manhood; that it is fairly able to handle the political situations which confront the Nation and State. True, the American Federation of Labor has indorsed woman suffrage; but you will please take particular note that on their great executive board they have no women representatives; in their important offices they have no women representatives. Should they not be consistent? Gentlemen, I am affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. I have been out in active service and know whereof I speak. I believe if the American Federation of Labor would take a referendum vote from the trade unions of this great country you would be surprised to find 75 or 80 per cent of those men are not in favor of woman suffrage. I believe that they desire to protect the women of the country; I believe they desire to extend to them every courtesy, kindness, and consideration, and keep their interest in the home, under the immutable laws of the Great Creator. I do not believe there is a more effective place for using the influence of a good woman than in molding young natures into good womanhood and good manhood to produce the ideal citizenship.

I am sure the trades unions of the United States believe in having the good influence of the home and of the mother in bringing up the citizens we desire, and I would ask you, in the name of American womanhood, for the constructive future of our Nation, to consider that it is a subject which 75 or 80 per cent of them will oppose, if it is submitted to them for their personal consideration.

Mrs. DODGE. The next speaker will be Mrs. Frank Goodwin, who was a former president of the association of the District of Columbia and started or organized it.

STATEMENT OF MRS. FRANK GOODWIN.

Mrs. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, ladies, and gentlemen: Your attention has been called to-day to many phases of the organized opposition to woman suffrage representing the convictions of thousands upon thousands of women over the age of 21 years who, with intelligent deliberation, have enrolled the

names in formal protest, representing also the large body of women who to-day are carrying a large share of the executive and financial responsibility of hundreds of civic and philanthropic enterprises throughout the length and breadth of the land.

If we who address you to-day indeed represent, as our suffrage friends have declared, the "slave half of human kind," it would not have taken us quite 50 years to find it out. Were this true, you would not find us here to-day urging you to allow us to continue in this state of enslavement. We would not be investigating at every turn the promises made to women by the advocates of woman suffrage—promises of greater freedom, wider justice, more comprehensive equality.

We are asking, quite reasonably, it seems to me, for the fulfillment now in equal-suffrage States of promises made a generation ago by pioneers of the equal-suffrage movement. One promise held out to many conscientious women was this: "Give the ballot to women, and in six months they will wipe out the liquor traffic." Many of you remember that. Believing before proof was possible, many adherents to equal suffrage were won upon this point alone. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union gave its indorsement as an organization solely because it welcomed any legitimate aid toward its desired end—the abolition of the liquor traffic. It is quite fair to ask what has been done by the ballot in the hands of women to modify, control, or abolish the sale of intoxicants, now costing the American people over \$1,000,000,000 a year.

The suffragists charge openly and by written word that the anti-suffragists are in league with the liquor interests. We recognize that some of the liquor publications and organizations are opposed to woman suffrage. That neither throws them into our camp nor constitutes us their allies. Their opposition is rapidly dying out. They no longer fear that which has proven itself harmless to them. The United Brewers' Association, in a letter to the Plainfield (N. J.) Courier-News, signed by Hugh Fox, secretary, states that the anti-suffragists have never received nor asked for contributions from them, although he adds, "We have had appeals from the other side."

Mrs. Ida Porter Boyer, of Pennsylvania, campaigning for equal suffrage in Oklahoma, a prohibition State, said in 1910 that "the only way to save the State to prohibition is to carry woman suffrage." And two years later, in an interview in Michigan, reported in the Detroit Journal, she said, "Yes; I'm afraid that the fear that if women obtain the ballot they will legislate saloons, boxing matches, horse races, and even smoking out of existence, is costing hundreds of votes. Nothing could be further from our minds. Personally, if a man wants to smoke or drink or go to a horse race or see some man batter another, it is his business, and none of mine. Suffrage will never attack personal liberties."

Some confusion evidently exists here as to the necessary and frequently inevitable limitations of personal liberty in organized human society.

The Equal Franchise League, of Denver, Colo., so feared an infringement of this "personal liberty" that it protested in March, 1913, to the council of the city and county of Denver against the passage of a bill known as the "O'Driscoll bill," making it a misdemeanor to sell liquor to a woman. The fact that this form of legisla-

tion was designed primarily for the protection of the child failed of apprehension by the league. The secretary of the Knights of the Royal Arch, a Pacific Coast liquor organization, stated in the San Francisco Examiner:

We long ago made a thorough investigation in the States where woman suffrage has been tried, and we learned that the liquor business has not been hurt in the least by the women's vote.

In November, 1912, prohibition was submitted to the voters of Colorado. The Denver Post stated that the most ardent workers for the saloons were women. The saloon won by a large majority.

In Boise City, Idaho, in June, 1912, local option was voted on, and the saloon won by 2,300.

In 1912, in 156 elections on local option in California, 57 were in incorporated cities, and of these 37 voted for the saloon.

In Los Angeles the vote in favor of the saloon was three to one in some districts where registered women voters were in the majority.

Wyoming, the oldest equal-suffrage State, had then not even local option.

Commenting upon these facts, the New York Times remarked editorially:

If the entrance of women into politics is not alleviatory, where is there any gain, either for them or for the Nation, in a grant of the franchise?

The contention here made is not that all women would, in voting, favor the liquor interests. Far from that. I contend only that upon this matter women divide as men divide, that the average condition remains unchanged, and that the promise that women will purify politics, in this particular at least, is not kept, because in the nature of the case it can not be.

It is possible to understand that even conscientious women would not even vote for prohibition which suffered such signal defeat in Colorado. The promise to the Women's Christian Temperance Union was impossible of fulfillment in the face of it. But why should local option, one method of liquor control favored by many men who are not prohibitionists, suffer defeat in Boise City and in 37 cities in California? This is certainly not in keeping with the often-repeated statement that when women have the vote they will wipe out the liquor traffic.

Meanwhile in eight of the nine prohibition States male suffrage alone still prevails, and Kansas was a prohibition State before it granted the franchise to women.

Whatever may be said for the methods of liquor-traffic control, and no intelligent person believes it should be uncontrolled, the fact remains that the strongest efforts to secure that control have been put forth by men, voting alone.

The case of Michigan in this matter has been repeatedly brought to your attention—Michigan, which was first thought to have in-dorsed equal suffrage, then, on recount, to have repudiated it by a large majority. The following are a few of the figures as given in the Michigan Manual. I will read but one or two and ask leave to file the others with the clerk:

Woman suffrage was defeated in Michigan by a majority of 96,144. Seventeen of the 83 counties in Michigan gave a majority in favor of suffrage. Twelve of these 17 are wet counties and 5 of the 17 are dry counties.

There are in Michigan 33 counties which are theoretically dry counties. Of these 33 so-called dry counties, 28 voted against woman suffrage. Eighty-four per cent of the so-called dry counties of Michigan gave substantial majorities against woman suffrage.

Every county voting on county prohibition April 7, 1913, gave a majority against woman suffrage.

The rest I will leave with you.

(The statement referred to is in the words and figures following, to wit:)

Woman suffrage was defeated in Michigan by a majority of 96,144.

Seventeen of the 83 counties in Michigan gave a majority in favor of suffrage.

Twelve of these 17 are "wet" counties and 5 of the 17 are "dry" counties.

In other words, 70 per cent of the counties giving a majority in favor of woman suffrage are "wet" counties and less than 30 per cent of all the counties giving a majority in favor of woman suffrage are "dry" counties.

There are in Michigan 33 counties which are theoretically "dry" counties.

Of these 33 so-called "dry" counties, 28 voted against woman suffrage. Eighty-four per cent of the so-called "dry" counties of Michigan gave substantial majorities against woman suffrage.

There are 50 "wet" or nonprohibition counties in Michigan, of which 38 voted against woman suffrage.

In other words, 76 per cent of the "wet" counties of Michigan voted against woman suffrage, as compared with 84 per cent of the "dry" counties, which voted against woman suffrage.

Twelve counties in Michigan voted for or against county prohibition on April 7, 1913, the same day on which woman suffrage was submitted to the electors for the second time.

Every county voting on county prohibition April 7, 1913, gave a majority against woman suffrage. (The total majority against woman suffrage in the 12 counties where the "wet" and "dry" question was the paramount issue on the same day was 12,733.)

Six counties—Genesee, Ionia, Sanilac, Lenawee, Clinton, and Montcalm—voted for county prohibition by an aggregate of 2,519 on April 7, 1913, and at the same time gave an aggregate majority of 7,026 against woman suffrage.

The other six counties—Emmet, Iosco, Huron, Jackson, Tuscola, and Calhoun—voted against prohibition by an aggregate majority of 3,149 on April 7, 1913, and at the same time gave a majority of 5,707 against woman suffrage.

It is interesting to note that the majority of those counties which voted in favor of woman suffrage are small, sparsely populated counties, situated either in the Upper Peninsula, as is the case with Baraga, Chippewa, Gogebic, Iron, Keweenaw, Luce, Marquette, Ontonagon, and Schoolcraft, or in the pine barrens of the back-woods district of the Lower Peninsula, as is the case with Alcona, Antrim, Benzie, Montmorency, and Roscommon.

The Michigan Manual of 1913 records these interesting figures:
On page 448:

The majority against woman suffrage in the election of November 5, 1912, was 760.

Page 778:

The majority against woman suffrage at the election of April 7, 1913, was 96,144.

Page 779:

Constitutional amendments relative to the initiative on constitutional amendments was adopted by a majority of 42,404.

Page 780:

The constitutional amendments relative to the initiative and referendum upon legislative measures was adopted by a majority of 66,669.

Page 782:

The constitutional amendment relative to the recall of elective officers was adopted by a majority of 92,331.

Any charges that the voters in this election were controlled by the liquor interests must therefore apply equally to the voters who enacted these so-called progressive measures.

I would request that this information be incorporated in the report of this hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. I will state that you may round out your statement and add those things, if you wish, to complete it.

Mrs. GOODWIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, but I think that will be sufficient for the committee to understand what I was driving at.

The suffragists want sympathy from you gentlemen by the declaration that they desire to help men, to stand shoulder to shoulder with men in the strife of party politics. We who have watched with deep interest the history of the last 10 years in regard to such matters as those I have brought to your attention feel, with Henry Howland, that "the best way to help a man is to help him keep his faith in himself."

I thank you.

Mrs. DODGE. Two women have spoken from Pittsburgh, both of whom represented those who are interested in the wage earners. I am going to introduce a third one from Pittsburgh, which will rather complete the trio—Miss Eliza D. Armstrong, for many years honorary president of the West Pennsylvania Consumers' League and for 52 years a worker in civic betterment—Miss Eliza D. Armstrong.

STATEMENT OF MISS ELIZA D. ARMSTRONG, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Miss ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, ladies, and gentlemen, Mrs. Dodge has kindly brought me forward because I am the oldest member of the crowd. I want to say to you that I began civic work the year of the war. I graduated in June, 1861, with a limited amount of education and a great desire to be doing something. My mother thought the simple way would be to put me into knitting socks and scraping lint for the soldiers who passed through Pittsburgh. At the end of the war a friend of my mother's took me into the relief association to dispense charity. From that I went from one thing into another and was a charter member of the first woman's club organized in Pittsburgh. I think you will call me a progressive for that. Then I was a charter member in Pittsburgh of the Consumers' League. I think there is hardly anything in there that I have not been more or less connected with, and from that standpoint I want to speak to you men to-day. I want to speak to you from my personal and practical experience.

I think if I had had the vote my work would not have been anything like it is to-day.

I remember years ago Miss Harding and another member of our Twentieth Century Club came to me one evening and said to me, "You have got to go down to Harrisburg; there is danger of the child-labor law being defeated." I am a very big woman, consequently they think I am pretty aggressive. They thought if I went down there that bill would go through. I did not know a single senator or representative. When I got down there I found five men, neighbors of mine from Pittsburgh, one is your junior Senator from Pennsylvania, another was a steel man, another was head of the

Coal Trust, and the other I forget what he did. After going to these men and telling them I wanted to add two years to the age of the children, they demonstrated to me that it would not be a very good measure, and I believe in arbitration, so when they said to me, "I will give you a year, and you go home and we will talk to the others, and two years from now we will see how it works out."

I went up to the office of the Commonwealth, and I said, "What do you think about this compromise?" "For God's sake, take it. I came here with five men, have been here for a week, and haven't got a thing we wanted."

I want to say this, that if I had gone down there like these men, with a vote, I possibly would have had to come home. I got what I wanted. I did not find a man that was not willing to talk on the subject with me, to explain to me what I was asking for was not right, and I had a heart-to-heart talk with them. They did not ask me whether I was a Democrat or Republican or Bull Moose or Progressive. They simply said, "I think a year would be a fair compromise, and in two years if it works well you can have it."

I want to urge our protest against your interfering with our women staying at home.

Mrs. Dodge. We asked Mr. Joseph G. Pyle, of St. Paul, Minn., who is the author of a very interesting leaflet on this subject, to speak for us to-day. He was unable to be present, but he sent a short letter, not his whole leaflet, and we have asked a representative from the Pennsylvania Men's League Opposed to Woman Suffrage to read it for him.

(The letter referred to is in the words and figures following, to wit:)

Those who oppose votes for women speak for what they believe and are sure to be the great majority of the women of voting age in the country. They oppose it as a movement, in the last analysis, for the deposition of woman from the high place she now occupies and the high service that she now renders in modern society. They stamp it as a measure of social and political retrogression. They know and believe they can show it to be against economic law, against biologic law, against the fundamental law of evolution, and fraught with the most disastrous consequences, not only to the State, but to the race.

It is against economic law because it proposes to set two persons to do the work of one. With men alone voting we are tolerably governed. With women alone voting we should probably, after a period sufficiently long for the accumulation of practical experience, be tolerably governed. There is no more sense in placing the same burden on both than there would be in duplicating labor in any other occupation; a mistake which modern efficiency has set itself resolutely to eliminate.

It is against biologic law and the law of evolution, because nature, in the development of the sexes, has indicated clearly by difference of function what was her intent. All evolution is a process of development from lower to higher by progressive differentiation of organs, indicating and requiring always a corresponding difference of function. Government, business, all human activity bows to this method by progressive specialization. Not the dispersion of work among the largest number, but its assignment to those who can do it best or to whom it seems most appropriate is nature's method. Only in so far as he adheres to it can man hope to win the best results or to gain them most economically.

Nowhere is this differentiation more plainly insisted upon by nature than in the difference between the sexes. The highest and holiest of functions has been set aside irrevocably for woman. Not only does she bear the child, but for months before and for many years afterwards she is the controlling formative influence in its life and character. When the word "mother" has ceased to mean all that it has meant in the past society will begin to disintegrate. This main feature of the "business of being a woman" is incompatible, on the

whole and in the mass, with the complete discharge of the duties of citizenship. One or the other or both must suffer.

No reproach is cast upon those who, by choice or through misfortune, miss this womanly occupation. The world and all its doors, education, the professions, art, literature are open to them. Because they have been denied the greatest of privileges and services let them not demand that other and more distasteful services be thrust upon the great mass of others who are unwilling to receive them and whose lives are already full to overflowing.

Politically, it is certain that, in so far as the woman vote might make any change, it would be for the worse. Pretty nearly all of the worst political ills of the country arise from two sources, the unenforced law and the stay-at-home vote. It is reasonably certain that the volume of each would be increased under woman suffrage.

The unenforced law is the product of legislation enacted for sentimental reasons or to fit exceptional cases instead of being, as every law should be, the expressed wish of a decided majority of the whole community. It is certain by the nature of the case, by woman's susceptibility to the appeal of sentiment and her necessarily less complete familiarity with the working conditions of the law—and it is abundantly proved by the statute books of any State where women have voted in large numbers for any length of time—that the number of unenforceable laws would be multiplied; hence increasing disregard for law and increased opportunity for the arbitrary exercise of public authority on the one side and favoritism and graft on the other. The form of government would become more and more paternalistic, ending inevitably in bureaucracy, which is the meanest form of despotism existing anywhere.

With men only voting, the absentee on election day is the curse of politics. When a full vote is polled it is extremely rare that the righteous cause and the deserving man fail to win. Probably a majority of women eligible to the ballot would always be absent from the polls. Statistics of States where votes have been given to women support this view. It is impracticable for very many women to vote and very many more will refuse to do so on any terms. There will be no neglect on the part of those whose votes are agreed by all to be undesirable. This widens still further the breach in the wall of good government.

But the great and what should be the conclusive objection to the ballot for women is that only a small number of them desire it, while probably the great majority are utterly opposed to it. At any rate, whatever may be one's opinion on this subject, common fairness should prevent any consideration of the extension of the suffrage to women until a majority of them have declared in an election held expressly to test their opinion on the question, and with women alone voting, that they want it.

The elective franchise is not a privilege but a burden. Every conscientious man feels it so. It costs time and labor. With more frequent elections and longer ballots the task increases. No good citizen will deny that the ballot, with its necessary preliminary study and activity, is one of the heaviest taxes that he pays to the State for the maintenance of Government. Men, who now hold the deciding voice, have no moral right to thrust this work upon protesting women; to do so is monstrous. It is equivalent to the levy of a high tax on a certain class of the community, because a few members of that class have asked for it.

The farmer has often been forgotten in general legislation for the benefit of others. Let not the farmer's wife be forgotten in considering the extension of the franchise. For her voting is a hardship too great to be endured. Aside from the preliminary preparation already spoken of, she must go to the polls, often in inclement weather, riding or walking several miles to get there and back. As comparatively few women on farms keep help, the house must be closed and all work be dropped for part or the whole of the day. Anyone who knows farm life knows that this is impossible. No granting of the ballot to women can prevent the actual disfranchisement by circumstances beyond their control of the women who certainly well deserve and are as well qualified as any to use the ballot. This consideration defeated a proposed suffrage law this year in a State where the vote was close.

This array of objections, inconveniences, positive injuries, and more than threatened disasters should make men hesitate to consider the extension of the franchise to women even if there were the gravest need for it. There is none. In practically every western State and in many others, soon in all, woman has every right before the law that man has except that of voting. She

has changed the old discriminatory laws into perfect equality of treatment by her influence without the ballot. It is seriously proposed to grant the ballot at the moment when there is no longer a pretext of need for it. Woman has raised herself, raised man, humanized the race, elevated civilization by the way of love; by an influence most powerful of all upon husband, father, son, and brother; by the law of self-giving instead of self-seeking, that is the highest precept yet enunciated for progress of any kind. She does not, as a whole, wish to change her functions or her methods. Those who propose to foist upon her a change so disastrous to her, to man, and to society should meet with a determined and final refusal. It is not too much to say that the future of humanity itself demands it.

Mrs. DODGE. I will introduce Miss Ella Dorsey, vice president of the District of Columbia association.

STATEMENT OF MISS ELLA DORSEY, VICE PRESIDENT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ASSOCIATION.

Miss DORSEY. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, and the assemblage, I have been allowed to come before you this afternoon to represent perhaps the most conservative body in the United States; that is, the branch of the District of Columbia women who, being accustomed to viewing matters from a national standpoint, because of the companionship of the men who make our national laws, have been obliged to take a national and not a local view of this question. We therefore beg to protest against the franchise being thrust upon us for several reasons.

We are told that we are not logical. It is not that we are illogical or superlogical; but we use that sixth sense called instinct, which belongs to woman, and can tell you why we do not want it, in addition to defining the reasons against it.

We are told that if the franchise is given to women it will help our country by bettering the condition of women and children, but we do not think it will. We want to see women and children protected, because we know that the mothers of the race and the children of the race are the hope of the State. We think it would not help us along this line to have the franchise for three special reasons. First of all, the last stronghold of chivalry is in the United States. This statement is borne out by the fact that upon our statute books are found laws for the defense of women and children that are not to be found equaled in any country in the world. We are told by foreign women that this is the paradise of women. We know from association with the men of our households, our fathers, our brothers, our husbands, our sons, who come home to us and talk to us of the affairs that mean the betterment of great national conditions, that they will listen to what our instinct prompts us to suggest is needed in the way of advance. They go out with this inspiration into the arena of politics, and they make laws that prove a bulwark against the wrongs we are fighting.

We know perfectly well, as good Americans, that the majority must rule in our case. When we stand against the suffragists, it is not that we do not admit and state positively that among them there are plenty of women absolutely intelligent, and patriotic also, but we question their judgment. It is the most alarming condition of autohypnosis that the country has ever seen, a condition that threatens not alone the welfare of womanhood, but of the country itself. We

know that the first step in hypnotism is a glittering object held before the eye. The mind is held oblivious of everything but that object. That object may be tin, or it may be gold, or it may be glass; it may be worth something or it may be worthless. These misguided ladies have held up before their eyes the ballot, which has induced visions and dreams, but the dreams have no reality and the visions are vain. We can not say that what they see is even a mirage, because a mirage is simply a false picture, an inverted image of a real truth, but these ladies have something before them that is not. They turn a deaf ear to the voice of reason, to the voice of experience, and they turn a deaf ear to even the voice of nature, and claim that in the ballot they find a remedy for every wrong that exists against woman or the cause of woman, even a remedy for all ills.

Indeed, gentlemen, we beg to urge upon this committee that, while this is interesting as the expression of a conviction and the expression of misdirected ideals, we all realize that such is not the case. Suppose the ballot were forced upon us by this minority. As patriots, we know, as I said before, from our men, that the majority rule is fundamentally necessary to a representative government such as ours. And yet here comes the self-elected, self-authorized minority, who wish to impose upon the majority of the women of the country what we know by that sixth sense is the worst possible thing to have forced upon us. We know that the men of our country have for years been trying to better the ballot as it stands. They are trying in every direction, in every State, to throw restrictions about the ballot which will put it in the hands more and more of those who are fit and capable and learned in the affairs of State, so that every vote by ballot will be the expression of a conviction. That has been the aim for 300 years, and is what the pioneers of this country, our forefathers, died to protect.

Suppose the ballot were forced upon the women of the country; we know that in the South it would go to the large colored population and in the North it would go to the foreign population, and we know perfectly well that to double the confusion in the present condition would not help us to reform the things we are seeking to reform. Gentlemen, you know that the last dying spark of nature which lies in woman is in what she owns. Do you suppose the wives and mothers and sisters and sweethearts of murderers, crooks, and criminals of various kinds would go to the polls with a view to voting their sons, husbands, and brothers in the electric chair, in the penitentiary for life, or to the gallows? They would not do that. They would still hope something would come in the future. I can not see where the reform would come in; I can not see where the betterment of the conditions would be. I can only see a doubling of the present confusion, of the wrongs that exist. I know the only hope for the ballot in the United States is for the best women in the United States to try to hold up the hands of their fathers, husbands, and brothers, to put that ballot where it belongs, in the hands of capable men.

I would beg you also to look upon this fact: The women of the country have a habit of expressing their opinions where they will, when they will, and how they will. The courtesy of our men makes it possible for us to discuss every subject not only on the face of the

earth, but in the heavens above and the waters under the earth. We are always given a hearing. Since Eve stood in the presence of Adam in the garden of Eden no woman has ever lacked opportunity to make herself heard. She does not always make herself understood, because she sometimes does not understand herself. Argument is merely a method of precipitating the real purpose of the speaker. We know that in this country, as in no other, all we have to do is to make up our minds what we want, where we want it, and when we want it, and then take it to the men of our country, who will lop off, cut off, or take off the impossible—because we are impossible sometimes; we dream dreams, too, even without the glitter of the ballot held up before our eyes—we know they will shape what we want, if it is a workable idea, into a law. We know that for 40 years past men have been improving the laws, and again I repeat that on our statute books there are laws providing a better protection for women, for children, and for the weak, helpless, and poor than in any land in the world. We know what folks say, that this tide of foreign immigration is due to the hope the country holds out for the betterment of the condition of everybody concerned. If the men are too old to reap the benefit, they are determined to come here and give the children a chance. Therefore it can not be said that women's votes are needed to better the statutes, but woman's influence is needed to help toward the enforcement of laws when passed. That is part of woman's work, to see that a good law is enforced.

And, gentlemen, we are told by the men of our country that the women of our land are their pride. God forbid that we shall do anything to lower that standard. I appeal to you, gentlemen, to look back over your lives, and in the name of your mothers who reared you and cared for you in childhood, of the sweetheart who helped to make youth glad, and of the wife who presides over the home, do not let this be thrust upon us; protect us against it, and help us to maintain our true rights, which are those of being now and always a real inspiration for the best men of our country.

Mrs. DODGE. Mr. Chairman, we have taken 15 minutes more than you gave us, and I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have one or two more speakers?

Mrs. DODGE. No; we have cut down sharply our program.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they prepared their statements?

Mrs. DODGE. No; we have only cut down the present speakers.

I wish to say that at our hearing, with the exception of the young lady from California, who spoke this morning, this represents the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage of the different States and two of the men's leagues which are connected with those, and we have made our case. We thank you very much for your courtesy. I know it has been quite a long story that you have listened to, and we now give up the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been very interesting.

The Chair has promised Mr. Wheeler to give an hour to him to present arguments against the pending resolutions, and has also indicated to Mrs. Scott that she would be entitled to an hour. It is therefore manifest that the committee will have to be in session to-morrow, when Hon. J. F. Heflin, of Alabama, has requested time and will speak for a few moments. Of course, that will make it necessary to

be in session to-morrow. I do not think it is possible to do it to-night, because that would be 2 hours and 15 minutes, and an hour for those who wish to reply, which would come to-morrow.

Mrs. McCULLOUGH. Do I understand that every time you add an hour to those who are opposed to this resolution that this committee will also extend our time an hour?

The CHAIRMAN. We will give you all the time you need.

Mrs. McCULLOUGH. We were trying to condense, and we thought we could finish in an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. If you need an hour we will give you that time.

Mrs. McCULLOUGH. Do you mean to answer those who have been heard and then later—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). No. I mean when we get through with those who are opposed to the pending resolution, then you will come to-morrow some time to reply. We will now go ahead, if Judge Wheeler is here, and he may present his side, or if Mrs. Scott is here she may proceed.

Miss BLACKWELL. Do I understand that we may have as much time as the opposition has had?

The CHAIRMAN. If you think you need that much and will insist upon it, I think the committee will try to gratify your wish.

Miss BLACKWELL. Do you not yourself think it would be fair that we should have as much time as they have had?

The CHAIRMAN. We have never tried to divide the time equally that way. We have tried to have a hearing to develop the facts on both sides; but I think you will be satisfied when you get through.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, before we pass upon that I think it is only fair that we should understand now just what the situation will be, and I think it is fair that both sides have an equal amount of time. Therefore I think it should be understood that if they desire it they should have as much time as the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. I think there will be no objection to the suggestion made by Mr. Lenroot that both sides shall have the same length of time, so that there will be no quibbling about that. I know of no objection to that.

Mr. Wheeler, the committee will hear you now.

STATEMENT OF MR. EVERETT P. WHEELER.

Mr. WHEELER. I have prepared a brief, which I have had printed, if the committee please. How many copies shall I hand up for the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. I think you may submit 11 and 1 for the reporter, 12 in all, if you have that many. You might submit one to the opposite side.

Mr. WHEELER. I am going to do that.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I feel the responsibility and the honor of this position very highly, but, as an old Democrat, I am bound to say that when I learned that this hearing on an application for a special committee on this subject, the only object of which can be to amend the Constitution under which we have prospered so long by taking the regulation of suffrage out of the hands of the States and putting it in the control of Congress—I

say when I heard that the hearing on that extraordinary application was to be in the conference room of the Democratic majority it made me think of an anecdote of John Van Buren when I was a boy. At that time there were two divisions of the Democratic Party of the State of New York. Some of the great Democrats tried to bring about harmony between the two wings of the party, and they invited a conference to be held in the ladies' parlor of a hotel in New York. Van Buren was invited to be present. He did not appear. When some one remonstrated he said, "I thought it was a joke to ask the Democratic Party to meet in the ladies' parlor, so I did not go."

When a proposition such as this, which is so opposed to the fundamental principles of our party, is seriously made it startles me to find that it should be seriously considered and argued here. But here we are, certainly in a most honorable place, and it is for us to show why this petition should not be granted.

I first draw attention to the fact that under our existing system, which gives to the States the regulation of this matter, we have greatly prospered. The fault I find with these excellent ladies on the other side, for some of whom I have great admiration, mistaken though I think they are, is that they are pessimists. When I read their literature I see lurid accounts of the people of this country. One of them says that our working people are chained to the great industrial machine. Then another says that the condition of family life in this country is most deplorable, and so they run the gamut. The great leader of them all, the driving wheel of the great concern, as I see her, this lawless Englishwoman who has been visiting our country lately, distributes, when she comes to our shores, a book so smutty that it is not allowed to be distributed in New York. I believe it was allowed in Chicago. It seems to me that their whole attitude is abnormal. As I see my country—and I am a man somewhat experienced in life and have seen a good deal of the various parts of these great United States—it has been going on, developing and improving. The conditions of family life have become more pure; the relation of husband and wife, of citizen to the Republic, have all been in a state, on the whole, of improvement and development.

It was said yesterday by Mrs. Harper, to whose remarks I listened with great interest, that the compromises of the Constitution were very well at the beginning, or when the condition of woman was entirely different from what it is now. The fundamental principles that underlie the relation between man and woman, parent and child, are just the same as they were in the days of old. I know the old spinning wheel and loom on which, when I was a boy, I used to see some of the good women in Vermont working, have passed away; they are relics of the past. But the fundamental principle that it is the mother who bears the child, who brings him up, and on whose nurture and admonition he depends—what the Apostle Paul calls "the nurture and admonition of the Lord"—is equally essential to-day as it was in the year 1776.

As I look back on American history, the mothers of the Revolution and the mothers of the Republic ever since have been the prime factors in our development and growth. It is because we think that the proposition that is now submitted to you is going to put upon those

mothers a burden that they ought not to be asked to bear, what Jane Addams termed, in the work she led before she took up suffrage, the waste of motherhood—it is because we object to that that we are here before you to-day.

Let me call attention, before I take up what I wish to make the main part of my argument, to one or two fallacies in the argument of my friends yesterday. Mrs. Harper's objection was this: That one-half of the American people—I think I got her words accurately—had complete power, politically, over the other half.

I agree, if that were true, ladies, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen—I can not refrain, Mr. Chairman, from feeling myself in the position I have so often occupied before the bar and occasionally making an observation to counsel on the other side. I hope I may be pardoned. It seems to me that remark shows the fallacy of the whole suffrage position and the unreasonableness of asking your committee to recommend to the House a special committee on this subject, or any committee to deal with it. The political liberties of every citizen are protected. Now, I beg of you, my friends, to assure your associates of this. It can not be successfully gainsaid. Every lawyer who has studied the subject knows it. The political liberties of every citizen of the United States are protected by the same law, whether that citizen be a man or a woman or a boy or a girl. The liberties are guaranteed by our great charter and by the Bill of Rights which the fathers have appended to that charter and by certain amendments which have been made to it since. There is no discrimination there between the sexes or between the minors.

Mrs. Harper forgot that half of our population is under the age of 21. On this theory, which she advances and argues to you, that every citizen should have a right to vote, what are we going to do with the boys and girls? Would Mrs. Harper maintain that they are entitled to the franchise? If she would not—and, of course, she can not, as that is an absurdity—how can she claim that any citizen as such has the right to vote? The people of the District of Columbia have not the franchise. They find when they go before the Committee on the District and make their wants known that they are heard. Their wishes are not always granted, I know, but it is too much to expect that the wishes of any citizen shall always be complied with; but they go and are heard. I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, who have been a great while in Congress, if upon the whole the rights of the citizens of the District of Columbia have not been fairly well protected and cared for during the time you have been in Congress, although they have not the electoral franchise. They have a great many franchises, but not that. And is not this city, on the whole, as beautiful a city, as well-governed a city, and as comfortable to live in as any city in the world?

So, it seems to me these facts to which I have called your attention completely explode the Harper theory that every citizen is entitled to a vote and that it is all wrong to have a part only of the citizens invested with the responsibilities of government.

In every State—in my own State, New York, for example—a man, to vote, must have lived 30 days in his electoral district and a year in the State. Then he must be in his home on registration day or he is disfranchised. At the election in 1910 there were 40 citizen delegates from New York to a convention in Cincinnati who were so absorbed

in our duties we could not get home to register, and we were all disfranchised. Do I complain of the registration laws, or does any good citizen complain of them? Not at all. All agree that the franchise to vote is not an absolute right. All that illustrates the great and fundamental proposition that the rights of citizens are protected by the Constitution and the courts, and not by this privilege of the ballot.

Then, again, Mrs. Harper says, "Have former committees done the suffragists justice?" She told us there has been six reports in 40 years, and five of them had been unfavorable. Evidently her idea of adequate—I think that was her word—attention was favorable attention. That is perhaps right from her standpoint, but from mine, it seems to me that to have considered this subject deliberately in committee and five times reported against it was sufficient. We think it is sufficient. We hope your committee will think it so. It can not be said that the subject, at any rate, has been ignored.

That distinguished lady, Miss Jane Addams, followed Mrs. Harper. As a philanthropist there is no woman in the world I have greater respect or admiration for than Miss Addams. I have known her for 23 years, and if I wanted to found a Jane Club or settlement I would go to her and ask her advice, as I did when I had something of that sort in my mind in New York twenty some years ago. But it does not follow because a man is a great lawyer that he is a good doctor, or vice versa. A man may be an excellent engineer and know nothing about political history. So a lady may be an admirable philanthropist and an excellent manager of settlements and not be a statesman. I wish for her own sake and for the sake of the country that she had given her full time to this work and not sought to be a leader in politics. It was an ill day for all of us when she was distracted from that great work of hers for this ignus fatuus of woman suffrage. She came to you and said, "If you have to deal with this subject in all its phases, why not give us a committee?" I notice that one of your members from Georgia made some replies on this subject. Let me say this, in every instance that I heard from those lips, she spoke of a case where Congress had dealt with the citizenship. My friend from Chicago failed to draw the distinction between citizenship, which is regulated by Congress, and suffrage, which is regulated by the States. It is a fine distinction, when we advert to it, but it does exist, and we must bear it in mind, and it is the fundamental principle of the whole subject. Congress determines who shall be citizens of the United States and the States determine who shall be the voters of those States.

I appeal to the last platform of the Democratic national convention. That declares:

Believing that the most efficient results under our system of government are to be obtained by the full exercise by the States of their reserved sovereign powers, we denounce the efforts of our opponents to deprive the States of any of the rights reserved to them.

The Constitution declares that the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members, chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

That gives to the people of Illinois the right to say that the electors of Representatives shall be elected by electors who are women as well as men. Each State has a right to decide that. This system has worked well. Why should we change it? Again, when we come to the election of the President:

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

That is the fundamental basis of the whole American system of electors for the President and Vice President. The amendment recently adopted, in reference to the election of Senators by the people, expressly leaves to each State the decision as to who shall be the qualified voters in the election of United States Senators. This makes our whole system harmonious. Congress and the people almost unanimously have approved it. Each State regulates the suffrage in that State.

Mr. WHEELER. Now, then, I wish to emphasize the fact that the founders of the Constitution, the men that made it, the men that advocated its adoption, were all agreed upon this as a fundamental principle. That has never been expressed better than in a letter by Mr. Jefferson to Mr. Madison, as far back as February 8, 1786, in which he said:

With respect to everything external we be one Nation only, firmly hooked together. External government is what each State should keep to itself.

So, when we came to the adoption of the Federal Constitution the Federalists agreed on this point with the Republicans. For example, Oliver Wolcott said, in the debate in Connecticut:

The Constitution effectually secures the States in their several rights. It must secure them for its own sake, for they are the pillars which uphold the general system.

So Hamilton said in New York:

Were the laws of the Union to new-model the internal policy of any State; were they to alter or abrogate at a blow the whole of its civil and criminal institutions; were they to penetrate the recesses of domestic life and control in all respects the private conduct of individuals, there might be more force in the objection; and the same Constitution which was happily calculated for one State might sacrifice the welfare of another.

The blow aimed at the members must give a fatal wound to the head; and the destruction of the States must be at once a political suicide. Can the National Government be guilty of this madness?

It seems to me for us now to undertake to regulate suffrage in each State by Federal enactment would be madness, indeed.

We have the language of Chief Justice Marshall in *McCulloch v. State of Maryland*:

No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the State and of compounding the American people into one common mass.

In conclusion of these authorities, let me read a statement of a great Virginian, J. Randolph Tucker, who was chairman of the Judiciary Committee of this House for a number of years:

As the Representatives are, as we have shown, representatives of the States according to their respective numbers and are to be elected by the people of the several States, it is obvious that the people of the State should designate the voters who should voice its will.

The only time, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, where this Government ever departed from that principle was in the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, and that, I beg to say, in the judgment of myself and of almost all men now, of every political party, was a great mistake. Misfortune and extravagance in the period of reconstruction were largely due to that partisan measure. It was, I remember well, conceived as a partisan attempt to hold in office a particular political party. It sprung up in the bitterness of that day, which was accentuated in the assassination of Lincoln. Its results were bad for the negroes and bad for the whites. Gradually we are growing out of it, but all that woe came as a result of the violation of this fundamental principle. We are growing out of it. I may speak for my friends of the North, and I believe it is the universal sentiment there, as well as in the South, that a great mistake was made in the adoption of that amendment. That was because of its violation of the fundamental principles of our Government.

This matter of suffrage should be regulated by each State, according to its own judgment, according to the judgment of its representatives, because conditions differ so widely in different States; and it is most unreasonable to give to Congress the power to fix a matter which is so distinctly the individual concern of the State.

Let us look for a moment to the experience of your coordinate body in Congress. They have had a committee on suffrage. They are constantly besieged by applications; they have made a report upon it. The whole tendency of the appointment of a committee upon a subject that is outside the jurisdiction of Congress is to invite discussion, constant application for a change, and to keep us all in hot water all the time. It is bad enough, Mr. Chairman, to be kept on the gridiron in my own State in fighting the constitutional amendment which is to be submitted to our people there; but to keep us in that controversy and in this at the same time, it seems to me, is unfair. I really hope that my friends on the other side when they consider this will reflect that to bring on this double campaign at the same moment is hardly treating the subject with that reasonableness, with that sweetness and light, that we are wont to expect from the fair sex.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it seems to me that in advocating here, as I do, this principle of home rule, I am speaking upon the fundamental principles that divide us. As for us who are opposed to suffrage for women, it is not because we do not respect womanhood; it is not because we do not respect that sex; it is because we do appreciate its real value. It is no disrespect to a woman who has given her heart and life to the care of a family to say to her that I know more law than she does. I have the pleasure to defer to her that she knows more of the care of the family than I do. It is important to have laws, and it is important, as we think, to have lawyers to advise about them, but it is a great deal more important to have good mothers.

I heard much yesterday about the laws. We have heard a great deal to-day about the laws in the different States and comparison of them. But, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, much more important than all laws is the enforcement of them. Much more important than the statute that goes on the statute book is the bringing up of the boy and girl in principles that will make them obedient to law. How

vain it is to put laws on the statute books about the age of consent if the good women who are engaged in rearing children neglect to bring up their boys and girls in principles of purity and self-restraint so that there would be no occasion for any law about the age of consent.

I believe in good legislation, but all my experience—and it is long—has taught me that underlying it all is this home education. We are prohibited by our Constitution—we must always remember that—from the teaching of religion, even the vital, fundamental principles of religion, in our public schools. All the more important is it to have those principles inculcated at the mother's knee. If they are taught there, they are imbedded in the character and make a part of life, and the future is secure. That is home rule. That is what we men who are striving here for our wives and our families and our children are endeavoring to secure. When I looked at that audience yesterday and reflected how many good women there were, how many well-meaning women, how many women who have been extremely useful in philanthropic work at home; when I reflected that they were drawn off from that, that they were coming here in convention to promote legislation and to fight us men who have been trying to bring about the same results that they are, my heart gave a great jump, and I pitied them from the bottom of my heart. [Applause.]

I tell you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, and I tell the ladies who are present here, too, I believe in the American man. We men are good, most of us. There are bad men; I have fought a great many; I do not deny that; but I believe, on the whole, in the American man, and I believe that he is ready and glad to keep his promise to love and to honor and to cherish. [Applause]. But when I see this person who is pictured in this paper [holding up a picture of Dr. Anna Shaw], and whose personality we saw yesterday, and when I see her shake her fist on the platform and say "We demand our rights," I behold an alternative. If rights are to be demanded with a clenched fist it means sex war. We can fight back. We men have been brought up, we have been trained by our mothers and our ancestors for many generations, to treat women with the greatest of consideration and respect. I may claim for the American man all over the world that is his characteristic. But if we are to be crowded, if the fight is to be brought on, I warn my friends on the other side that there will be blows to give as well as blows to take. But I hope, I pray, that it will not come to that. I hope that you here, who are standing in the advance guard, who are standing to protect this citadel of our American liberties, the right of the State to protect themselves, will stop the fight and say "So far thou shalt go, but no farther."

I wish to submit my brief and a quotation from "The Last Leaf," by James K. Hosmer.

(The papers referred to are in the words and figures following, to wit:)

HOME RULE.

[Brief of Everett P. Wheeler on argument before Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, December, 1913, against proposition to establish a special committee on woman suffrage.]

An association of women, who favor political suffrage for women, ask for the establishment of a special committee of the House of Representatives on woman suffrage.

As chairman of the Man Suffrage Association which has been formed in New York, and expressing the convictions of many associations throughout the country who oppose the extension of political suffrage to women, I present this argument on their behalf.

In our judgment the regulation of the right and duty of voting at elections should be left where it is now, with each State, and should not be controlled by constitutional amendment.

Our country is the most prosperous in the world. It has increased in population, in wealth, in material comfort, in purity of domestic life, in the elevation of political and ethical standards, to a marvelous degree. It has been for more than a century, and still is, "the promised land" for millions in other countries who are attracted by the freedom, the prosperity, the opportunity of this. They have come hither and are rejoicing under our banner. This banner is one, but there are many stars in its field. Its motto, "E Pluribus Unum," expresses the fundamental law of our national existence. We are a union, but that union is composed of many States. It is the right of each State to regulate its local affairs without interference from the other States. Thus we have succeeded in avoiding the jealousy and bitterness which have been a poisonous mixture in the union between Great Britain and Ireland. What the Irish people have for more than 100 years struggled to obtain is local self government. Their argument for this is largely drawn from the successful experience of that system in the United States. It shows ignorance of history, and above all, ignorance of the history and politics of the United States, to seek to change this fundamental principle of our Government. For this principle the Democratic Party has always loyally stood. In the platform of its last national convention it made the following declaration:

"Believing that the most efficient results under our system of Government, are to be attained by the full exercise by the States of their reserved sovereign powers, we denounce the efforts of our opponents to deprive the States of any of the rights reserved to them."

Nothing to my mind shows more clearly the absolute unfitness of most of the women who advocate woman suffrage to exercise that duty and responsibility than their appearance here to urge upon Congress the abrogation of this fundamental principle.

Let us consider first what the Constitution now declares:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." (Art. I, sec. 2, Constitution.)

The provision of section 1, Art. II, in reference to the election of the President is similar:

Art. II, sec. 1: "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress."

It is Thomas Jefferson to whom the Democratic Party has always looked as its founder. To the principles of democratic government formulated by Thomas Jefferson the party in the national convention of 1912 reaffirmed its devotion. This great man, in a letter to Madison, February 8, 1786, thus expresses himself:

"With respect to everything external, we be one Nation only, firmly hooked together. Internal government is what each State should keep to itself." (1 Tucker (J. Randolph), Const. U. S., 317.)

But it was not alone Jefferson who advocated this doctrine. Whatever differences there might be in regard to the powers to be intrusted to the General Government, the Federalists, as well as the Democrats, were one in their devotion to the principle of local self-government. In the debates in Connecticut on the adoption of the Federal Constitution, Oliver Wolcott said:

"The Constitution effectually secures the States in their several rights. It must secure them for its own sake, for they are the pillars which uphold the general system." (2 Elliott Debates, 2d Ed., 202.)

But we have on this subject the authority of a greater than Wolcott—one of the authors of the Constitution; one who, with Madison and Jay, united in the composition of the celebrated letters now published in one volume as the Federalist, which advocated effectively the ratification of our Constitution—a man whom we delight to honor, Alexander Hamilton. In his speech in the convention of New York he used this memorable language:

"Were the laws of the Union to new model the internal police of any State; were they to alter or abrogate at a blow the whole of its civil and criminal

institutions; were they to penetrate the recesses of domestic life and control in all respects the private conduct of individuals, there might be more force in the objection; and the same Constitution which was happily calculated for one State, might sacrifice the welfare of another." (Ibid., pp. 267, 268.)

"The blow aimed at the members must give a fatal wound to the head; and the destruction of the States must be at once a political suicide. Can the National Government be guilty of this madness?" (Ibid., p. 353.)

These memorable statements of the fathers of the Republic were echoed by Chief Judge Marshall, delivering the judgment of the Supreme Court in *M'Culloch v. State of Maryland*:

"No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States and of compounding the American people into one common mass." (4 Wheaton, 316.)

And now, to conclude my reference to the teachings of the wisest of American statesmen, let me quote from another great Virginian, who was for years chairman of the Judiciary Committee of this House—J. Randolph Tucker:

"As the Representatives are, as we have shown, representatives of the States according to their respective numbers, and are to be elected by the people of the several States, it is obvious that the people of the State should designate the voters who should voice its will." (1 Tucker, Const. U. S., 394.)

By strict adherence to these sacred principles, fundamental in the United States Constitution, we have prospered. Where we have deviated from them we have suffered. The one great deviation from this principle, the fifteenth amendment, was adopted as a party measure amid the bitterness engendered by the Civil War, intensified by the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. This ill-starred amendment undertook to ignore fundamental differences of race and to impose upon every State the obligation to put the blacks upon an equal footing with the whites. These zealous women now assembled in convention, a small minority of the women of America, are seeking to imitate this evil example.

Do not misunderstand me. When the blacks were emancipated it was obviously the duty of Congress and of the American people, whose representative sit in Congress, to secure to them their civil rights. These were protected abundantly by the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments. The evils of the reconstruction period, its oppression, cruelty, and extravagance, mainly sprung from the partisan attempt to go farther and compel each State to submit its local suffrage to the jurisdiction of Congress.

It has been said that the subject of woman suffrage is one of great importance, and that it is fitting that there should be a special committee of this House to deal with that subject. The subject is undoubtedly of great importance, but it is not within the jurisdiction of this House, as I have shown. It ought not to be. The only object of the suffragists in applying for a special committee is to promote the adoption of a constitutional amendment, which should prevent each State from regulating this important subject in a manner suited to its needs. In this respect we can profit by the experience of the Senate. The same argument was addressed to that honorable body. The Senate determined to appoint a special committee. This committee was mainly composed of the advocates of woman suffrage. They have made a report to the Senate favoring the adoption of a constitutional amendment, which would take the settlement of this important question out of the hands of the States and vest it in Congress. It is idle to advocate the appointment of a committee on a merely academic question. You might as well have a committee on the precession of the equinoxes. That is a subject of great importance, but we do not want a committee upon it.

This House is already burdened with momentous duties. It has been in almost continuous session since the inauguration of President Wilson. It has to deal with the annual expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars; it is charged with the duty of ascertaining how these sums, taken from the hard-earned dollars of the American people, shall most wisely be expended for the good of the whole. It deals with great problems of interstate and foreign commerce. All these subjects are within its present jurisdiction. They require the most diligent study, the most serious consideration of every Member of this great representative body. The moment you appoint a committee to consider the subject of woman suffrage, confessedly not now within your jurisdiction, you invite petitions, you invite arguments on both sides, you take the time, the thought, the energy which should be devoted to the discharge of your duties and expend them elsewhere. It was not for this that the people

sent you here. They knew very well the limits which the Constitution places upon your authority; they understood the powers of the several State legislatures; and they sent you here to do your duty under the Constitution and not to break down its fundamental principles.

It is most fitting that those who are opposed to the extension of political suffrage for women should appear here in defense of the principle of "home rule." We are the "home rule party," as my daughter styles us. We stand for the sacredness of the home, the security of the home, the protection of the mother and the family. The suffragist doctrine of the independence of woman is odious to us. We believe in the dependence of man upon woman, and of woman upon man, each supreme in the proper sphere. The same intrinsic principle is the basis of our argument before your committee to-day. We believe in the authority of the Union, but equally do we believe in protecting the rights of each individual State. It is only by preserving the security and authority of each that the happiness and prosperity of the whole can be attained. Happiness and prosperity depend upon obedience to law. Home rule is the law of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will suspend proceedings until tomorrow morning at half past ten.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned until tomorrow, December 5, 1913, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., Friday, December 5, 1913—10.30 a. m.

The committee met pursuant to adjournment, Mr. Pou presiding.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM FORSE SCOTT.

Mrs. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee—

Mr. Pou. Will you kindly give your full name?

Mrs. SCOTT. Mrs. William Forse Scott, of the Guidon Club Opposed to Woman Suffrage, a national organization of men and women.

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Committee on Rules, we regret very much that we can not have the advantage of speaking directly to the gentlemen of the committee themselves instead of by proxy, due to the fact that there is not a full attendance this morning.

The legislative committee of the Guidon Club is here in behalf of the great majority of women who feel their legitimate safeguards slipping away from them and do not know how to protect themselves. If men, as representatives, and in particular our official representatives, fail to act in our interests, the suffragists are justified.

I do not mean by this that you shall necessarily do what we wish. I mean literally act in our interests, representing our interests; otherwise representative government is a farce, and a demagogue, not a Democrat, is at the helm, and political dexterity and not the law must rule.

This condition is already reached by the suffrage movement. Its progress is a marked disregard for law. Illinois is voting, though the vote there is the prize of a lobby not yet justified by the courts. Each successful campaign has been carried by an appeal to the people to raise against the law and the existing government under the dictates of self interest.

In Los Angeles the suffragists chanted to the beat of marching feet as the labor unions and the Socialists' organizations marched bareheaded past the prison in which the McNamaras awaited their fate, "You vote for us and we'll vote for you." There the women opened registration booths at the doors of the churches on Sunday morning.

Mrs. Pankhurst was allowed to enter our ports at the demand of suffragists, in clear defiance of the second and the thirty-eighth sections of the immigration act. They even demanded of the President that she be admitted on the ground that the vote of women had helped elect him.

The recent attack upon the President for a failure to prejudge the question by giving it his approval in his message, is another instance of the demand outrunning its justification. You have now before you a glaring evidence of the spirit of lawlessness which inspires this movement. You are asked to appoint a special committee on women suffrage in your body. For what reason? What is your authority over the electorate of the States? You might as well be asked for a committee on single tax.

In this morning's paper we notice another evidence of the profound disregard for law evidenced by this movement. It is reported in the paper that yesterday Mrs. Catt said that "If under the Constitution of the United States our demands can not be granted"—that is not quoted literally, but that is the purport of it—"tear up the Constitution!" Tear up the Constitution of the United States! In order that a section, a small minority of women, may have the thing which they desire, their leader says, "Tear up the Constitution of the United States!"

Mr. CAMPBELL. May I ask a question, Mrs. Scott?

Mrs. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. May I ask where Mrs. Catt made that statement? Where is she reported to have made it?

Mrs. SCOTT. It was reported in the Washington Post this morning, I think. I quote it from the newspaper report. I hand you a copy of this morning's Washington Post that you may see it.

Many years ago, possibly 40 years ago, the same thing was said by another leader, Miss Anthony, who, when it was suggested to her that her demand could not be granted constitutionally, said, "Then do it unconstitutionally."

We wish only to call your attention to the fact that the demand which is made upon you and upon the country is a demand made regardless of existing laws.

You are given no convincing arguments as to the right of women to vote, but you are told that the women voter will do certain things, which you have heard discussed at length for two days. Of course, you know this has nothing whatever to do with the demand upon which the hearing is granted.

These contentions are due to a misunderstanding of the nature of government. Women are throwing away their only opportunities to accomplish the reforms they clamor for—the right to enforce the law.

Please note, gentlemen, that society—the state—is an aggregation of families based upon the principles for the protection of the weak; that only one function of the state depends upon an aggrega-

tion of individuals organized for the exercise of force—for government which is impersonal, showing no discrimination. Government is only properly active in maintaining conditions under which the organized social, constructive activities may safely and freely play.

The taking over by government of functions belonging to the state, to society, is destructive, because government is the operation of force, and paternalism injects into government the elements of weakness which involves the defeat of the aim of government.

You are then asked to appoint a special committee on woman suffrage. We are quite clear that there is no occasion for such a committee unless there is some legal right in the Federal Government to a control of the State electorates. The need for such a committee depends upon a constitutional amendment which lies back of this demand.

The Guidon Club urges upon you this point and asks that you limit your consideration to it. It involves two questions: Have you or have you not authority in the matter? In order to acquire authority, is a constitutional amendment advisable, which would give power to the central Government to determine the qualifications of State electors?

I ask your particular attention to this proposition, that the question before the country, not before you, is definitely the right of non-combatants to assume the functions of government. The proposed amendment would not settle the question of right any more than the fifteenth amendment settled that question for the negro in the South.

The appointing of a woman suffrage committee would tend to prejudge the question of the amendment and to obscure the real meaning of such an amendment. It would, in fact, serve as a fictitious seal of approval of a question not yet before the House, as it did in the Senate.

We are here to protest against the appointing of such a committee, and I have the pleasure of introducing three who will lay before you the arguments in support of our position. We will confine ourselves to the immediate question, except in so far as we are compelled under protest, to give attention to the superficial and irrelevant matter injected into this hearing by the other side.

Our reasons for opposing the appointment of a special woman suffrage committee will be briefly stated, because the statement without elaboration before the committee is all that is necessary.

I will have great pleasure in introducing first Mrs. Rossiter Johnson, the president of Guidon Club. She has been long and very well known to the public, and really needs no introduction.

She will be followed by Dr. Rossiter Johnson, whose reputation for sound understanding, based upon great learning, has preceded him.

Dr. John C. Ten Eyck, a well-known lawyer of New York, whose knowledge of vital public affairs, gained through many years of devoted service to his State, qualifies him to especially judge of the merits of this question, will immediately follow Dr. Johnson.

Then we will have no further argument to present, and you will find stated in a brief way our arguments which we have left with the chairman of your committee for each member of your committee.

I now present Mrs. Helen K. Johnson.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HELEN K. JOHNSON.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Guidon Club represents a membership in 17 States, and there are several independent organizations, one in Minnesota, another in Illinois, the Men's Association, membership in Montclair, and other different towns. The few fragments that I have to offer are brief, and I trust will not infringe unduly upon your time.

I would call your attention first to two or three matters which concern woman's constitutional rights, and which, so far as I know, have not entered into this discussion.

The first is this: The people in the suffrage States have had their rights as citizens denied and abridged by the forcing of woman suffrage upon the State. The United States Constitution guarantees to every State a republican form of government, but a republican form of government ceases to exist in a State where those who make decrees are not identical with those who can maintain those decrees, as must be the case where women cast a ballot that they can not defend.

We have lately had a striking proof of the entire inability of the women voters to enforce their own decrees in the appeal of women politicians of Colorado for Federal aid in securing the spoils of office. The same women had threatened to form a woman's party "because men counted them in or counted them out," as they chose. Of what use, then, would be a woman's party? They would still be nondefenders, and the defenders know that a higher law than the Constitution counts women out and forbids her ever being really counted in.

Another constitutional matter is this: In the appointment of a woman suffrage committee in the House of Representatives, a step would be taken in the direction of placing in the United States Constitution an element of weakness that would be likely to end in its destruction. No such instrument is ever intended to provide for its own annulment.

One other matter of serious import is this: In making any advance toward woman suffrage, this Government would be playing into the hands of two forces within the United States that desire the Republic's overthrow. These forces are Socialism and Mormonism. The latter introduced woman suffrage into this country while Utah was a Territory. Socialism is responsible for every other particle of political woman suffrage in this country or in any other. Historically, woman suffrage is the child of communistic rationalism, and you in Washington have lately had the striking proof that modern woman suffrage and modern socialism are now one and the same movement—a movement which in the Old World has been grounded in hatred of religion, hatred of home, and hatred of the married life, and whose ideal is to make the woman's life exactly like the man's.

In New Zealand and Australia, especially in the latter country, the fact of the coalition is now clearly to be seen. Not one law or act for woman's benefit is there asked or given. Her vote is used by socialistic labor to accomplish its desired end. The party rules every State except Victoria, where the germ of a true republican government is still struggling for life.

Suffragists have claimed "that woman suffrage must be the final outcome of the evolution of a true democracy," but history teaches that directly the contrary is true.

Russia was a communistic autocracy, and had woman suffrage as an accompaniment of government ownership and taxpaying. The effort of the Duma toward constitutional government immediately introduced the principle of the defender's duty—one man, one vote—and woman suffrage disappeared.

Uneasy but thrifty France and sturdy little Switzerland have no women suffrage, because they are Republics. The Chamber of Deputies of France has just met a very decisive defeat on the woman-suffrage amendment to give the commercial women a vote—and certainly if any vote was proper in a republic, that vote would be proper there, where the women are so much in evidence in the business world. There is more or less woman suffrage in every monarchy, introduced there by socialism.

Idaho owes its woman suffrage to both Mormonism and Populism, and every other suffrage State marks a socialist triumph.

Oregon presented 26 highly socialistic propositions at the same time that woman suffrage was forced on the State by the narrow margin of 4,000 in a vote of 118,000. California ran politically mad in submitting 44 highly socialistic measures with the woman-suffrage amendment. The Socialists of the southern counties carried it, while it met strong disapproval in the sounder Republican northern counties.

Gentlemen, woman suffrage is undemocratic. This country for a century had shown the world the model for universal government—liberty under law. "Votes for women" was first heard in the French Commune, and the strain of the Marseillaise, now played for the march of suffrage, is most ominous.

This country has now reached its greatest crisis, because certain women are leading in a blind attack on their own sex integrity, at bidding of a delusion as old as prehistoric days—that of tribal ownership and tribal stagnation.

STATEMENT OF DR. ROSSITER JOHNSON.

Mrs. WILLIAM FORSE SCOTT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I now present Dr. Rossiter Johnson.

Dr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is an oft-quoted remark of St. Paul that "all things are lawful, but not all things are expedient."

Let us consider, in the few words that I shall offer—for I shall not speak long—the question of expediency.

We shall not deny, of course, that it is perfectly lawful for the House of Representatives to appoint the committee that is asked for. For the present, at least, I certainly will not deny that it would be lawful for Congress to place the question of such an amendment before the States.

Of course, that is the object of the committee and nothing else. Therefore the real question we are to discuss is whether the object is right, and, therefore, would justify the appointment of the committee.

The expediency of any proposed course is often tested very well by considering what would be the result of the opposite course. Let

us, therefore, consider what would result if Congress should not place any such amendment before the States.

Every State that wants suffrage can have it by putting it into its own constitution, and if it does that neither Congress nor anybody else can stop it. Therefore, if Congress should never present any such resolution or any such proposed amendment to the States, it would not prevent any State that wants suffrage from having it. It seems to me, therefore, that the proposed course of Congress not to do this thing would harm no State; and it is with the States that Congress, in this matter at least, must deal.

Let us think now what might be the result of the opposite course. Suppose that Congress sets before the States the proposed amendment to the Constitution providing for woman suffrage throughout the country. You all know, of course, that by the Constitution it may be amended when three-fourths of the States vote in favor of the amendment, and then the other one-fourth must take it, whether they want it or not.

We have 48 States in our Union. If such an amendment is proposed, it is quite possible that 36 States might vote for it and 12 States vote against it. Suppose that the 12 States that vote against it should be these—and these are quite as likely as any: Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Massachusetts. There are 12 States. Suppose these 12 States vote against it and the other 36 vote for it; then it becomes the law of the land. The total population of these 12 States is something more than 47,000,000, and that exceeds by more than 3,000,000 the total population of the other 36 States.

You will remember that on this matter each State would have just one vote, and the vote of Nevada, which has fewer than 100,000 inhabitants, could offset the vote of New York, which has 9,000,000 inhabitants—a difference of about 100 to 1. You would therefore allow a minority to force that proposition upon the majority.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary even to suppose that 12 States would vote against it. Suppose that just one State positively does not want it; it would be perfectly pertinent for that State to say to the others: "Have woman suffrage, all 47 of you; have it in your own borders as soon as you please and as much as you please, but do not crowd it upon us who do not want it. Have your joys or your sorrows, whichever they may prove to be, within your own bounds, but do not push them over into ours." I do not see that any logical answer could be made to that.

The Constitution of the United States, which I assume everybody before me has carefully read and considered, was made by the wisest men in the land—George Washington, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, and others—who spent 100 working days making it, and produced an instrument which has been called by statesmen abroad the most perfect thing of its kind that ever was written, and who were very careful to discriminate between the rights of the States and such rights as should be delegated to the General Government. They put in that Constitution nothing that was not distinctly given to the General Government or forbidden to the States should be assumed by the General Govern-

ment. If you study the Constitution, you will find just where they drew the line. It is perfectly clear.

If there is anything that is necessary to have uniform throughout the country, such, for instance, as the coining of money, those things are given to the General Government. If there is anything that is not necessary to have uniform throughout the country, those things are left to the States, very properly, as we all think, because we have a very large country and a very varied country, and the circumstances in one State are not necessarily the same as circumstances in another; and particularly in this question which we have before us now there is a wonderful difference between the women of some States and the women of some others—that is, I mean some of the women—as there is in the men.

Furthermore, if Congress proposes this measure to the States, there is a probability that in some of the States it would be made a football. That is to say, when a State has voted on one of the amendments it claims the right to change the vote at any time before the general result has been announced by the Secretary of State, in Washington, and this has actually been done. On one of the amendments that was adopted the State of New York voted one way, and the succeeding legislature reversed it and voted the other way. The same thing was done on another amendment, in Ohio, and I think there is another State—Illinois—which did the same thing. This thing has actually been done at least three times. When the legislature of next year reverses that and votes the other way, you have no means of knowing what is the real sentiment of the State.

MR. KELLY. Does the gentleman hold that that is because at the present time a legislature can vote one way and the succeeding legislature can reverse its action with reference to a constitutional amendment?

DR. JOHNSON. It has been done.

MR. KELLY. Is there not a Supreme Court decision that says it can not be done? Is there not a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to that effect?

DR. JOHNSON. Is there? Very well; then I take that back. I was not aware of that decision.

Finally, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if such an amendment to the Constitution should be adopted, it would prevent any State that has woman suffrage and that finds the experiment is a mistake and a detriment, which is quite possible, from ever getting rid of it except through the cumbersome machinery of another constitutional amendment.

For these reasons it seems to me we had better all cheerfully obey the spirit of the Constitution and be content therewith. I thank you.

MR. LENROOT. Dr. Johnson, may I ask you a question before you take your seat?

DR. JOHNSON. Certainly, sir.

MR. LENROOT. Do you see any objection, Dr. Johnson, to Congress itself voting upon this proposition?

DR. JOHNSON. How do you mean?

MR. LENROOT. Having a vote upon the proposed amendment.

DR. JOHNSON. If Congress votes to propose an amendment, the amendment will be proposed?

Mr. LENROOT. No. The amendment is pending by way of being introduced. Is there any objection to affording such an opportunity so that Congress itself may pass upon the question rather than merely a committee of Congress such as this?

Dr. JOHNSON. Pass upon the question of submitting it?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Dr. JOHNSON. No; I do not see any objection. That is the real question we have been discussing.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, you understand that this committee has no jurisdiction over the question of recommending either way to Congress upon the merits of the question, but only upon the creation of a committee to consider the question. Is it your idea that this committee or Congress itself should not create a special committee unless it is committed beforehand favorably to the proposition?

Dr. JOHNSON. I understand that the committee before me is to determine whether there shall be a committee on suffrage. Is that right?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes, sir; that is right.

Dr. JOHNSON. Then if the committee before me shall come to the conclusion that there is no need or no propriety in such an amendment to the Constitution, they necessarily would conclude that there should not be any committee on the question.

Mr. LENROOT. That is just the point. This committee might be unanimously of the opinion that this proposed constitutional amendment is not expedient, but they would then deprive Congress itself of passing upon this question, and this committee alone would pass upon it, while they might be opposed to this amendment and yet feel that it was fair that Congress should pass upon the question rather than this small committee.

Dr. JOHNSON. Is it not in the province of the committee before me to propose that to Congress itself without the intervention of another committee?

Mr. LENROOT. No; it is not.

Mrs. SCOTT. May I ask if it is not in the province of some committee now to consider the question? Does it not go to the Committee on Elections?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mrs. SCOTT. The point of the Guidon Club is simply that we wish this matter left in the hands of the committee not committed to either side. It is not that we do not wish the amendment submitted to Congress. It is only that we do not want a prejudgment by a specially chosen committee. I think that is all we wish you to understand by our appearance here to-day.

I now desire to present Mr. John C. Ten Eyck, of New York.

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN C. TEN EYCK, OF NEW YORK.

Mr. TEN EYCK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I know your time is limited, or ought to be, and although you have given us a definite allowance of time, I feel I should be as brief as possible. And yet, before addressing myself to this specific question as to whether or not there should be a special committee, I want to say one word with respect to the attitude of men generally and myself

in particular with respect to that which has been called "Ladies' battle."

Perhaps as noticeable a fact with regard to this discussion as anything else has been this, that while men are vitally concerned with the outcome of this discussion, they have been markedly reticent about expressing themselves concerning it.

I say vitally concerned, not because their property rights are affected, although that may be deemed to be vital; not because their domestic relations are affected, although that might be deemed to be vital; but because this discussion raises the question as to whether they shall do their duty with respect to that thing which nature, by giving them power, has lodged with them as a responsibility. That is the question.

I do not want to hide behind that dear lady who is the sharer of my happiness and of my woes, but I have to say that I doubt if I could be here to-day if it had not been that I discussed this question with her. I want to make a frank admission of that fact. She said to me, "What is this all about?" I said, "It is very much like this: Here are my two sisters, Kate and Mary. Kate says that my father made a mistake when he created me the trustee of his property under his will. She says that I am stupid and tyrannical, and that, at least, in the very nature of things she should be my cotrustee in this business; that all these rules about wills and that sort of thing have nothing to do with the case. Here is the present will; the estate is here; the final and ultimate question is, How is that going to be efficiently managed? Wipe out this law business." It is Kate's position I am stating. "I am fit to attend to this business. I do not ask it all, but I do want to be cotrustee."

My wife said, "That is all right, but what does it amount to?" Technically this is practically the conversation. I reply, "They have it in court; it is here."

My sister Mary says that she thinks it is all right as it is; she does not think I am tyrannical. She loves me and she knows that it would not please her mother if she were living. With all those sacred traditions and feelings back of them that make our civilization what it is, with all those people who stand by the emotional and moral history of the race and civilization, without attempting to analyze and pluck the heart out of the past and bring it up and measure it by their personal experience—all those who talk of the sacred traditions and remove them from our civilization—she said, "I do not think they will like this kind of thing." My wife said, "It is in court, is it?" I have never wanted to talk of my "in-laws"—she is a southern woman—"and I do not propose to do so now, but you go down there. I do not want Kate to be your cotrustee in the administration of this trust."

Mr. CAMPBELL. May I ask a question, Mr. Ten Eyck?

Mr. TEN EYCK. Certainly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the objection to having Kate as a cotrustee?

Mr. TEN EYCK. It is that question that I desire to discuss in an orderly way.

But, in the first place, I wanted to apologize and to protect myself in entering upon this discussion and entering upon this lady's battle.

She said, "Go down there and be in court." And here I am. I

may add that she turned to her mother and said, "Mother, don't you think that is right?" And her mother replied, "I certainly do." So I have my mother-in-law's approval in the premises, and I feel moderately safe under the circumstances.

There may be, and doubtlessly are, technical reasons known to you, growing out of the conduct of this great business of governing the country that is in your hands, that are before you in determining the choice of this committee. Concerning these things, these technical reasons, I know nothing, and that gives me a kind of hesitation about "butting in" here. But I do know about the kind of a subject that is under consideration, and I can, although not familiar with the conduct of business in Washington, form a conception of the kind of committee that would adequately and understandingly consider and recommend with respect to that subject, what their experience should have been, what their origin should be, what their animus from the time of their appointment, what their general view of law and of civilization, what their prophetic insight with respect to what is to happen as a result of laws to be enacted. I can form some conception of the kind of committee that looks before and after.

It is pertinent here at this hearing to define, if possible, what is this subject matter and what question will arise. I claim it is not pertinent or necessarily pertinent that I should express my opinion as to what the solution of those questions shall be. It is enough for me to put before you what the questions are that will come before that committee, so that you can judge what kind of a committee can pass upon them properly.

There may be things that I can not think of, but I can see that the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing the exercise of suffrage without disqualifications with respect to sex—that is not the exact language, but without consideration of sex—would affect the federal system of government. I can see that it would affect the government itself, any democratic government, whether in a federal system or not. I can see that it would affect the domestic-relations law and the domestic relations themselves. It would affect the law of property, and it would affect the individuals, citizens of this country, both in the present time and in the generations to come. The effect upon the federal system has been laid before you. The committee will have to take that into consideration. I submit that the committee should be warned that by reason of its duty in the administration of our affairs here in Washington it must carefully consider the workings and underlying philosophy that are back of this federal system by a due consideration of the interests and the property rights of each of the component members of our federation.

I will pass from that subject.

MR. CAMPBELL. Before you pass, as I understand it, you are not opposed to the appointment of a committee if you can get the kind of a committee you want?

MR. TEN EYCK. The kind of a committee I shall try to describe as right.

MR. CAMPBELL. That would be a committee that would decide your way?

MR. TEN EYCK. No; by no means. I really think that it will be necessary for me to present this in my own way. I had anticipated,

after showing what this subject was, to explain, subject to the allowance of this committee, just what I think of the qualifications necessary for the final committee to pass upon this subject and what they should be. It would be preferable, if permitted to do so, and to take that up a little later.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But that is not the question before this committee. The question before the committee is the expediency of appointing any sort of a committee. Then it is for Congress to elect that committee.

Mr. TEN EYCK. There is where the absence of technical knowledge of which I have already referred to comes in. I have been under the impression, gathered largely by the public statements of the advocates of this measure, that this question had been before the Judiciary Committee. Is that the case?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It has been.

Mr. TEN EYCK. I had that in mind, and I assume that unless this committee should be appointed the matter will rest before the Judiciary Committee; but, of course, I have to admit my technical ignorance.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The matter would remain before the Judiciary Committee if a special committee were not appointed.

Mr. TEN EYCK. That is what I thought.

With respect to the effect of this measure upon government, independent of whether it is a Federal Government or not, I think I can introduce this subject best by reference to what was said by one of the advocates of this proposed report in favor of a special committee. I think it was Miss Harper who said in her discussion that the men hold on to their power. That is true. We do hold on to our power; we can not let go of our power.

Miss HARPER. I said, Mr. Chairman, that they did not like to divide their power.

Mr. TEN EYCK. The report in the paper indicated otherwise.

Miss HARPER. You know they make mistakes sometimes.

Mr. TEN EYCK. Let us put it the other way. The men do not want to divide their power. In other words, the indication was that they want their power to be with them solely. In point of fact the power is with them solely and must be with them solely.

Government does not create power; it organizes power. There is just as much power in this country to-day if we had no Government as there would be if we should organize a Government to-day. But by its organization that power, subject to the influence of public opinion, or conscience, or whatsoever you will, is organized to do the will of public sentiment in a republic, of a monarch in a monarchy, and to express in acts the wishes of the people of the country.

When things are going along as smoothly as they do in the United States we can walk the streets and not realize that this is not a society for ethical culture. Government is not a persuasive organization. It is a coercive organization. Back of the law stands the policeman; back of the policeman stands the power of the country; back of the power of the country stands the militia, the Army, the citizenship—coercive. That power at the present time is lodged with men.

It may be contemplated, but not by us, not by any men—I speak confidently—not by any member of this committee, not by any man whom I have ever seen, that this coercive duty shall be assumed by

women. What is the real proposition, therefore, that they make? Not that we shall divide our power, our coercive power, with them; not that we shall draft an equal number of women to be exercising the power that stands behind the State; but that we shall exercise this power in accordance with their wishes as much as in accordance with our wishes. That is the point.

In the ordinary affairs of men it is not customary to appoint a cotrustee or a coadministrator with any man to regulate how he shall administer or manage that power which he has—because property is nothing but power. It is not customary to appoint a coadministrator with him unless he is incompetent. Some of these ladies, recognizing that fact, say to us, "Yes; they are stupid; they are tyrannical."

But there is one thing that is true: If you were a committee of ladies I might have to argue that matter, but you know we are not tyrannical—I talk as man to man—and perhaps that is one reason why we gentlemen have not taken this thing up sooner. You know we have most earnestly considered more than anything else this proposition; that it has been the dearest wish of our heart, the dearest effort of our life, to do that which has been best for woman! That question is not open for discussion before this committee. We may be stupid, but we certainly have loved them—not only those whom we specially love, but all American men have wanted the best for woman that we know. I do not know but what we have gone perhaps too far in our idolatry. I do not know but that we have perhaps ignored the God in the temple and put the woman in the shrine where He belongs, and have served her even when she asked those things that we thought were perhaps bad for her permanent advantage.

I live in what is the center of commercial America, or right by it. I come down in the train from the little city of Yonkers, of 100,000 of people, and I get there just about the time the great procession starts on Fifth Avenue every day, tens of thousands of women, and "Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed as one of these." The sea, the land, the air, the field, the forest, all wild and animal nature, everything ransacked. The famous Army of Virginia, Gen. Lee's army, could have been equipped and maintained by the money expended for the beautiful and valuable things that are displayed in that gorgeous procession. And that is the end of American effort! When men throughout this country succeed, when in the contest of business life they get on top, when serving those who are dear to their heart—and you know what they are—they unite; they have managed to get through where others have failed and died. When their success is conspicuous they move to New York City and their wives join in that gorgeous procession. Whither does it go?

If you look at that procession you will not find men in it, or very few, and most of these inconsequential. But if you go across to the street teeming with commerce and with competition under the Sherman Act, you will find those men still at their work in their offices. We like to have those whom we love happy in walking in that gorgeous procession if they see fit. We have not loved woman too little. If anything, we have surrendered the practical power of directing that of which is the economic power in the world and they

are directing it along their own channels; but can we do too much to please those who have brought happiness and order into the world?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where there is one woman in that Fifth Avenue procession there are millions who have never entered it.

Mr. TEN Eyck. I only speak of those who have the power. Those who have not the power have not the election as to where they will walk, whether it be on Fifth Avenue or the Bowery.

I know as well as any man can know that while this has been the thing we have been willing to do, and that many women have taken advantage of our willingness, yet there is a great work that has been done by women in building up civilization. I see the homes, the typical homes where this civilization began; man sustaining, perhaps, and providing the meals; woman producing order, beauty, happiness, a heaven upon earth. Woman has not made it; man has not made it. Both together have made it. And what do we see about us? If we look with keen and honest eyes, what we see about us is the great growth and progress that has been made under the existing theory and practice of things which are now arranged and which, with equitable powers, I desire to support and to praise and to maintain as far as I am able.

But let us get back to this question of the effect upon the State of a rule that is not lodged in the hands of those who have the power. That was the peculiarity of a monarchical State. A few there, owing to the ignorance and inability to get together of men generally, were able to organize and did organize in the early stages of society. They had the only available power, because the rest of the men in the State could not get together. They then organized the power of the State. They did not create power; they organized it. They had in the hands of the government all the power there was in the State available for fighting. They had a standing army always ready to strike where disaffection might arise. So now, if we should put the power to decide the direction along which the power of the State shall run—now in the hands of men and always there—into the hands of others than those who are to exercise the power, it will go along with peace and war; now in peace we can see it.

You can go out to Colorado, though it makes little difference where you go. The condition of things in Colorado is very like it is in any other State. It has been my great pleasure to go there and meet the people of that delightful Commonwealth. I do not want to testify on this subject; I may be prejudiced, but I do not think the tone of man toward woman was as respectful there as it is in New York State. That was my notion—I am honest about it—after going in to Colorado's social life. That is simply what I saw. They seem to have a kind of contempt for woman in the State of Colorado when they were talking among themselves. So far as the Government was concerned, it was going on all right. I do not think it was any better. All the appearances and remarks that appeal to the senses, that are familiar to us on the great White Way, were rivalled on the main streets of Denver. On every hand there was something to appeal to man, to ask them to go and spend money in places of amusement, indicating not a better life and not any change in the nature of men who were bound to be amused. There is nothing different there in the West from what there is in the East. You could get just as much to drink, or could do any of those things which are criticised.

It seemed to me to be about the same, so far as I could tell from external appearances.

The Government goes on all right, but suppose there comes a question when, having appointed this coadministrator to select with us the channels along which our powers shall force men through government, this coadministrator says to us, "Now, here, let us rule that this shall be the case, or that shall be the case." Is there any likelihood that at any one time a minority of men united with a majority and almost unanimous sentiment of women shall say to the majority of the fighting force, "You must do so-and-so?" If so, what becomes of the Government, where the power is here on the negative side and the State says "Do this" on the affirmative? It would be for us to decide about that, where the Government under such circumstances will be stable.

Mr. KELLY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he bases the power of the United States Government on the standing army?

Mr. TEN EYCK. On the contrary, sir; the very point I make is that it is the function of the ballot to notify all men, not simply what the people of this country say is public sentiment, made up by men and women, perhaps more by women than by men.

Mr. KELLY. Then the power is really the affection of the people?

Mr. TEN EYCK. Coercive power is with the fighting men. The direction is made by the public sentiment. That is what determines how we will vote here in this great assemblage. We try to find out not simply what men want. You are Members of the House of Representatives. We do not simply want to find out what fighting men want; but, knowing the fighting men are behind us, not simply the Army, but the great body of citizenship, we are constructed by history—and let me say that I know the fundamentals of American history, and I assume we all know our history—and we know it is the great body of men of our country who, in times of war, stand back of our policy. Our standing Army does not amount to a row of pins. Why do these men stand back of our policy? Because by the ballot we not only find out what the people want from the way they vote, but we have also found out that back of what policy the majority of men stand. That is what the ballot does; that is what the ballot shows us. The ballot shows us not only what is the will of the citizens, but shows where the power of citizens is to enforce that will.

Mr. KELLY. The power, you say, is not in the standing army but in the affections of citizenship?

Mr. TEN EYCK. I say it is in the power of citizenship, the fighting strength of the citizenship. Do not let me refer to the Civil War. Affections have nothing to do with it. It is muscle and dollars. That is what does it when the time comes. Meantime we have such a state of perfection here that we live and die on the theory that it is a society for ethical culture, and it only happens in a generation or two that something occurs, and we realize that this Government after all is dealing with the primal will of manhood that wants to have its own way, and that if we are going to have it straight we must know, before we get a policy, where the majority of fighting strength is; otherwise we can not safely adopt that policy. It does not always happen. Let me bring it right down to date:

If there are three parties in an election, as there were three parties in the last election, you can not then find out where the majority of fighting strength is. You do not know in this administration whether the majority is back of the policy of the Government. But this you do know that of all the coherent forces that are organized in the United States, the prevailing, strongest cohering political force stands back of the administration of the Government as it is now constituted. That you know, and if you had woman suffrage you never would know it!

Mr. LENROOT. It is your idea that it would be better in manhood suffrage to limit the vote to only those men who are able to fight?

Mr. TEN Eyck. No. I do not think you could do that. I do not think this is better; this does not meet with any approval in particular of mine; I am simply stating what I believe to be a fact, as a matter of observation and thought and consideration among men. I believe a review of history shows that government is a forcing thing, not a persuading thing. That is my notion.

My point is that if there should be a government that should be directed by, perhaps, the nonfighting elements of citizenship against the wishes of the fighting element, the only way to see that the government would be preserved would be a way foreign to our institutions, namely, by the creation of a standing army that would keep the people in order. That is an expedient which is adopted in all monarchies—a great standing army.

Would there be likely to be—this is another question which would come before the committee—a clash between the feminine will and the masculine will?

Mr. CAMPBELL. As a member of the committee, may I remind you again that we are not interested in that question at this time? We are here for the purpose of getting the views of those who believe in the expediency of appointing a committee and those who do not believe in that expediency—a committee that shall consider that question, a committee before whom you could go and make that argument. That would be an argument before the Judiciary Committee, considering the submission of a constitutional amendment; that would be an argument before the Committee on Woman Suffrage if it were considering a constitutional amendment. This committee is only considering the creation of a committee on woman suffrage, and we are now in the third day of that consideration.

Mr. TEN Eyck. I have always tried to receive the dispensation of Divine Providence without protest. I am in the hands of this committee.

My opinion has been that since there was practically a choice between the Judiciary Committee and the new committee, it was pertinent to show the questions that would come before the coming committee in order that we might decide whether the Judiciary Committee were best equipped to pass upon these questions, or whether a new committee shall be appointed to consider the subject of suffrage alone. My point has been that in considering the subject of suffrage, it was so dovetailed in the entire object of our law that perhaps the Judiciary Committee would be better able to consider it.

I have only touched upon one point, and I see that I will not have time to go to the questions of property and the domestic relations and discuss them even briefly. But I do think it is pertinent to say

that the committee must be aware of the theories underlying our Government. In my opinion it must be able to pass upon these questions knowingly; its members must have been educated by the performance of constitutional duties that have brought it to their attention underlying principles of the law that regulate a democratic government. That is my opinion—that if there be a body peculiarly learned, peculiarly broad in its scope and the operation of its researches and its conduct in regard to public affairs—if there be such a committee, that is the committee that should take a look at what has been done in the past, a look at the future to see what part this new theory of government has played and will play; to see what relation it bears to the entire theory of law as we understand it. Whatever you call it, that should be the committee. I regret that the same reticence has kept me out of this subject, and the same feeling of unwillingness to butt into something almost makes it impossible for me to continue with any feeling of restiveness on the part of this committee. I should have liked to have talked about the domestic relations and property rights. I will only ask to be able to finish up what I had to say about the relations of this matter to the conduct of our General Government.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, certainly.

Mr. TEN EYCK. I thank you.

The question which may come before this committee—and the committee must be selected with reference to its ability to answer this question—is this: Is there any likelihood of a condition arising in this country where the will of almost all the women and a minority of men shall be opposed to the great majority of men?

Mr. KELLY. Right there, before you start that argument, permit me to make this inquiry: Do you object to the formation of this committee on equal suffrage to consider the question and to take up arguments as you have made them?

Mr. TEN EYCK. I prefer that we should take the known rather than go to the unknown.

Mr. KELLY. You object to the formation, then?

Mr. TEN EYCK. I believe that that committee will be formed under known conditions. Not knowing the technical ways of this Congress except as they come to us through the press, I do not presume the Members of the House seek places upon a committee with any indelicacy, but that in the performance of their duty as representing their constituencies, I imagine if a Member of the House had a constituency that demanded a place upon that committee for him or demanded that he should seek it, in the operation of human nature, which pervades in Congress and all over the world, possibly he would have a better chance to get upon that committee than the man who did not seek it—if I have any knowledge, from my experience, about such matters.

I know very well that in my State, engrossed as we are in economic and other questions, there would be no demand, no widespread demand for any Member of the House of Representatives from the State of New York to get on that committee. But I have a shrewd suspicion that the people of the State of Colorado, for instance, might want to have one of their Representatives on that committee. That is the way I think it will work out. I want not a packed committee.

We meet here to-day for the first time. A man who bears witness for himself is often mistaken. It is foolish for me to say to you what I shall say, but I say to you as man to man that I want nothing but a square deal in this business, nothing else; nothing else, before God and man. That is all I want. I want to avoid and not to seek a packed committee, in the name or heaven.

Mr. KELLY. Your objection is altogether to a packed committee?

Mr. TEN EYCK. My objection is to a packed committee in the sense that I have mentioned it—with no offensive intention and in no offensive sense—a committee that naturally would grow out of conditions that exist in the United States. I think this committee should be chosen and this matter should be committed to a body that is organized so as to consider the general state of the law.

Mr. KELLY. And if it were fairly chosen it would be all right to have a committee?

Mr. TEN EYCK. I should not object to it. But as a prudent sane man I would do with this matter what I would with respect to my property or that which is dearest to me, the guardianship of my child. Some one would say, "Would you prefer to trust your child with this old family friend of yours? He may never have been the guardian of any other child, but you have confidence in him. Would you prefer to put your child in his hands or in the hands of somebody who may be selected in the future and whom you do not know?" That man you might select in the future might be better than my old friend—and I do not speak of "old friends" with respect to what has taken place, although I realize that those who are disposed to listen only to the surface of arguments might make that point with me. It is not because the Judiciary Committee has any record on this subject at all that I make the argument that the matter should go to it. It is because I have confidence in the institutions of government. It is because I am not a critic of this House or its ways. I do not challenge its judgment. I believe that the Judiciary Committee is fitted to be intrusted with the consideration of all important laws, being a committee on the general state of the law. I never heard that committee had this record with respect to woman suffrage until I read the speeches of the proponents of this measure. It struck me that it is the proper committee before which this matter should go.

With regard to the difference to the view between the policy of man and that of woman, that might result in the condition I mentioned, we know roughly that men have stood discipline, believing it to be kind. We know that women have thought about taking care of the stragglers with almost divine pity, deeming it to be kind. There is the difference in policy for you to expect. There may be greatly larger funds spent on charity. Take it in connection with this feminism. I do not know what there is in that. I can not believe that these women are in any way affected by that. I know that some are, of course, because they wrote the books. But I mean to say those whom we see and those whom we admire and respect. What they want is really to do good. They claim we are superficial in our views. I do not think so. I think they have not studied government as we men have, and I really think they do not see any reason, that they do not even know that it is indelicate to say to us, "You use your power the way we want you to. You let us be

cotrustee of this estate, the United States, that has been devolved upon you." They do not see any indelicacy about that. They claim it as a right that they should direct the way we should act, shedding our blood in support of that which we deem to be right. They do not see they are perfectly right in setting a chain of circumstances that may result in the defamation of the male population of this character. They stand back as they ought to stand back, protected and maintained as they have a right to be protected and maintained, and in their protection and maintenance directing the men through their sweet inspiration and through their love of pity and their love of kindness, in the maintaining of civilization from within. We are in a new dispensation. Before Christ came upon this earth only the sword was known. He planted in the heart of man the principle of love. Women have kept that up. Let us keep them in that state.

I thank you.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Ten Eyck, before you take your seat, let me ask you this question: It is charged by the proponents of this matter that the Judiciary Committee, by reason of other matters, will be unable to give due consideration to this question. If this committee should be of the opinion that that position is well taken, what do you think the duty of this committee would be in the premises?

Mr. TEN EYCK. If this committee is of that opinion, I think it ought to make a full effort to study this subject; but I do not believe this committee will ever think that that conscientious, able Judiciary Committee, with respect to so as an important matter as this, ransacking every department of human life and proposing a change in civilization, will say, "We have not the time." That is what I do not believe.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ANNIE RILEY HALE.

Mrs. HALE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have come before you not so much to make an argument as an appeal. I would appeal to you in your twofold capacity as men and as politicians, and I will assume that you are men first and politicians afterwards, though I do not forget that you are both. I know that in the latter rôle you must keep a windward eye and ear to popular signs and portents, but I confess to being a little shocked by the honorable Senator from Oklahoma, who, I had thought, made a specialty of personal convictions, when he said before the Senate last summer, "We should give women the ballot in obedience to the popular demand for it, whether we think it best for them or not," and when I asked a friend in the House from Kentucky whether statesmen were not supposed to have any opinions of their own not necessarily handed them by the crowd, he replied with the charming candor of the Bluegrass, "Not after they learn where the majority lies."

With these remarks in mind, I ask you to please reserve your judgment and action—especially action—in this matter until you are quite sure "where the majority lies." Do not mistake the insistent buzzing of a few near-by insects for the distant droning of a whole swarm of bees. It may not be so bad as you think. I have not personally inspected their rosters, but I am reliably informed that, with all their activity—dating back to 1848 in this country—the suffragists can show but a meager 10 per cent of all our women enrolled in their membership. That they themselves know they are in a hopeless

minority is sufficiently evidenced by their repeated refusal to submit the question to a referendum of women. So please give us a chance to bring out the opposition which we believe to be greatly preponderant in the country, but which is unorganized—it is only recently that any of it has been organized—and unrecorded, because many women are content to merely live the antisuffrage life and regard the proposal to organize with nervous dread lest this may in some fashion drag them into unpleasant notoriety.

Much of the antisuffrage sentiment thus far expressed is unreasonable, assigning all sorts of foolish reasons why women should not have the ballot; and these, of course, have been seized by the more astute of the suffragists and turned into boosting for their still more foolish propaganda. The opposition of the woman who can give no reason for the faith that is in her may illustrate what Prof. Muensterberg of Harvard calls "one of those wonderfully sapient instincts which the human race discovers every now and then for its own protection."

May it not be the mother instinct of the normal woman to protect the race and the home? She may not be able to analyze the feminist movement to its logical outcome, but she feels instinctively that it is aimed at the peace and security of her kingdom, at the destruction of her dearest possessions. The mother hen who catches an ominous shadow aslant the sunlight does not require a thorough knowledge of the hawk's anatomy to know that her brood is in danger, and sounds the warning cluck that gathers them under her wing.

Do not, as politicians therefore, commit the disastrous blunder of deciding too hastily as to the popular side of this votes-for-women contention; and do not, as men, I beg of you, go counter to the normal instincts of the mother type of woman. For she is the type who is to save us from the worst effects of this feminist squall if there is to be any salvation, so do not despair of the Republic or do anything rash until you have given her time to make her voice heard.

True, there are some mothers, and apparently devoted and well-meaning ones, in this suffrage movement, drawn in under a misapprehension of its meaning or upon some irrelevant side issue or stress of emotion, even as every hysterical tide floats on its bosom some worthier craft than the flotsam and jetsam which is its natural freight. In time of rain floods it is not unusual to see a comfortable home, with its inmates all aboard, the baby sleeping in the crib, riding the high crest of a swollen river, but no sane observer imagines for a moment that the proper place for a happy home is atop of that roaring current.

Equally out of place is the sane, well-balanced woman in a suffrage parade; she simply doesn't belong there. Mme. Gadski, the world's greatest soprano, calls the woman who wants to vote "a dislocated woman," the best name I have ever heard for her. The recent testimony of two such artists as Gadski and Ethel Barrymore, that the woman who does not find her happiness in her home need not look for it elsewhere, should greatly strengthen the faith of women who have known only the home joys and might be adjudged incompetent to decide.

It is not my purpose at this time, Mr. Chairman, to combat in detail the various suffrage heresies and fallacies, which I assume are as obvious to you as they are to me. Not long since a Tennessee

paper offered a \$2.50 cash prize for the best suffrage argument that could be advanced, and it may interest you to know that the one to capture it was that much-battered Colonial dictum about "taxation without representation" being tyranny. Manifestly, Tennessee appraisal of suffrage logic is not up to the standard in some other quarters, and mine is, perhaps, below the average Tennessean's, for I think \$2.50 was an awful lot to pay for that! You know, of course, that the suffrage is not based on property rights in our country, that men do not pay taxes for the voting privilege, and that the Colonial plaint applied to Commonwealths—not to individuals—and never had any connection with the question of suffrage.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, as I view it, this whole suffrage propaganda excels in joining things together which fact and reason unite in keeping asunder, and is chiefly made up of bland assumptions, unsupported assertions, and syllogisms wherein "the premises are on one side of the globe and the conclusions on the other, with no bridge between." You, as experienced politicians, know the absurdity of all this fuss about the ballot as a mode of expression or a weapon of defense for anybody; and the very emphasis the suffragists place on it and the lengths they are prepared to go to obtain it convict them of being without a sense of proportion or a true sense of responsibility, whilst the gigantic reforms they propose to effect with it prove their amazing ignorance of the limitations both of the ballot and of themselves.

I do not wish to be uncharitable to the suffragists, many of whom are misguided, well-meaning reformers, but in my observation of life those who are seeking real responsibilities and real opportunities for doing good do not exhibit the temper of these suffrage enthusiasts; but people who are seeking personal gratification and self-glorification do behave precisely like the baffled militants, whose window smashing and bomb hurling are only the logical expression of such a mood. Of course, I know these wild-eyed women claim to be battling for their rights and for the sacred cause of freedom, in whose name so many crimes continue to be perpetrated; but clear-eyed students of government and sociology know that the dividing line between freedom conserved by law and unbridled license lies in the spirit of compromise, which says one person's rights must stop where another's begin, and the most enlightened societies have decreed that the rights of both men and women shall stop where the rights of children begin—in the larger sense. You may or may not know that William E. Gladstone and Herbert Spencer, who at first advocated woman suffrage, reversed their judgment and opposed it after mature deliberation had convinced them that the family, and not the individual, was the true social unit.

The slow evolution of human society from savagery and barbarism into civilization was built on the altruistic, not the individualistic motive, and the words of Christ, "A little child shall lead them," found literal fulfillment in the evolution of womanly chastity and the establishment of monogamous marriage. In the days of the Matriarchate women owned the property and ruled the clan; but marriage was promiscuous and chastity was unknown. It is quite true, as the suffragists charge, that man imposed the convention of chastity upon woman, not because he was so enamored of it either for himself or for her, but that he might bequeath to his children the

fruits of his toil. Marital fidelity in the wife came about through the law of inheritance, and there were scientific reasons also why the well-being of the child, who typifies the race, demanded the chaste woman more than the chaste man; though if women had desired strict chastity in men, and if they desire it now, they can enforce it, even as it was enforced upon them, by demanding it. I commend this to the thoughtful consideration of the suffragists, who are proposing to abolish the double standard of morals and commercialized vice with the woman ballot. It is much simpler than that, if they are really in earnest about it, and it will be no more difficult to persuade all or a majority of women to agree to hold men to a certain line of conduct than it will be to have a majority of the feminine ballots all fall together on the side of the good, the beautiful, and the true.

Despite all this powwow about representation through the ballot, a very little analysis serves to show that nobody gets even a shot at it unless he is lucky enough to vote for the victorious candidate and can insure his candidate's behavior after he is elected. From certain mutterings anent "the people's representatives who fail to represent," I infer that not even voting for the victorious candidate is eminently successful in every instance. Now, the great strategic advantage which woman enjoys over man in this, and which makes the ballot such a negligible quantity for her, is that she makes the candidates for both sides; and, if she makes them right, the election can't go wrong for her; for righteousness and truth will rule the councils, no matter under which party name the councilors may serve.

The question is, therefore, which is the more important work, to make the laws or the lawgivers? Which portion of the edifice does the architect consider more essential to the solidity of the whole, the foundation of the superstructure? Whence this nonsense, then, about "only half of the human family being represented in government," and the effort to separate "man's world" from "woman's world"? Man wouldn't have any world but for the woman's world, from which it springs and on which it rests; and if there is as much wrong with man's world as the suffragists charge, there is no escape from the inference that there is something radically defective in the womanly substructure. In every reform movement it is all important to locate the fundamental cause of the trouble, and if woman will only reform herself she will not find so much wrong with the world. It is the old story of the poor workman quarreling with his tools, the quack doctor treating external symptoms, and the illogical woman who always wants to "poke the fire from the top." If some of this suffrage enthusiasm could only be directed toward establishing training schools for mothers it would be far more helpful in reforming governmental abuses than will ever be effected through the ballot. For what women need is not more power, but more light; not more responsibility, but a quickened sense of responsibility; not ballots, but balance.

The economic folly of taking woman from this all-important, highly specialized labor of building the race to squander her energies in the uncertain, oftentimes turbulent game of politics should be patent to any thoughtful intelligence. Incidentally, although some suffragists maintain the foolish contention that the ballot with all that pertains to it would not interfere with woman's paramount business,

the distinguished head of the national woman suffrage organization, Dr. Shaw—who, whatever else may be said of her, is not lacking in brains—does not make this mistake; she perceives the incompatibility of home duties with political activities, and is proposing to make “motherhood a governmental institution,” and have the babies cared for en bloc by the State. As Miss Shaw has never had any babies of her own, we can forgive her this suggestion; but what we can’t forgive is the uniform tendency of these suffrage orators and writers to speak slightly of motherhood and its responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, I do not resent my exclusion from the privilege of competing with negroes and hobos at the polls; that is hard enough on decent men—so hard that it keeps about half of them away from the polls—but I do resent deeply the insulting things which some of the suffrage women have uttered before this Congress in regard to the office of mothers, and I resent it not only for myself, but for every devoted, self-respecting mother in the country. Why, as the mother of two sons only, I do not yield in dignity even to the office of the Presidency, for a man can fill only one office, even though the highest, whereas I, through my sons, may fill both the Presidency and the Chief Justiceship and be myself besides.

And if so much glory is in store for me with only two sons, only think of the kingdoms awaiting the mother of four or perhaps six! Yet some stupid suffragette, writing in the November Century, for whose opinions, by the way, the Century editors bespeak the highest consideration, says: “The time has passed when women in their walled cells can stupefy their souls in dreams for their children.” A woman who could write that is too stupid to cast an intelligent ballot, and is her own best witness against her propaganda. She also says:

Women for a long time to come are to be the actively unconventional sex, and the sooner their conventions, which are not theirs but men’s for them, are broken down, the easier will be the road for those who come afterwards. When a woman goes out deliberately and breaks a law, she puts herself outside the pale of mere convention, which can never seem so important to her again. This is always great personal gain, and does not leave mere bystanders unilluminated.

Let us hope that the lawlessness here expressed and finding an echo in much of the suffrage output in this country will not “leave Congress unilluminated.”

Very characteristic of the suffrage attitude toward law is the statement so blithely reiterated by the southern suffragettes, that they will give the ballot to the negro woman, but will prevent her using it by the same methods which withhold it from the negro man; but southern statesmen who are deluding themselves with this notion would do well to reflect that the outside world which, in its sympathy with their struggle for white supremacy, has condoned the makeshifts employed to defeat an unwise law imposed on them without their consent would have a very different attitude toward such irregular devices resorted to for the purpose of annulling a measure which southern men themselves have helped to place on the statute book. The introduction of the negro woman into politics would mean also the restoration of the negro man, and what both would mean in the States with large negro populations I leave to your imaginations, assisted by the memory of reconstruction days. If there were no

other reason against this amendment, this consideration alone should defeat it at the hands of every self-respecting white man, North or South; but there are numberless good reasons against it, and not one in its favor which can stand the test of critical analysis. No, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, women will not improve the ballot, and the ballot will not improve women, and every consideration of public and private good demands that they be kept apart.

**STATEMENT OF HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM ALABAMA.**

Mr. Pou. We will hear you now, Mr. Heflin.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss the question as to whether or not you should report in favor of the creation of a committee on woman suffrage in the House of Representatives I desire to submit a few observations on the subject of woman suffrage.

It has been my pleasure to attend the hearings from the beginning. I heard the advocates of woman suffrage present their side, and on yesterday I heard the ladies who are opposed to woman suffrage present their protests against having the ballot thrust upon them.

Mr. Chairman, when I heard these good women saying that the great body of normal women in America did not want to vote and when I heard them speaking so feelingly and earnestly about the home and woman's duty in the home I felt as if I had been attending an old-fashioned love feast. I do not know when I have been so stirred and moved as I was by the earnest appeals of these gentle women, who, in their opposition to woman suffrage, represent 92 per cent of the home-loving women of America. I am not opposing woman. I am doing that which I believe is for the very best interest of both men and women. I know, Mr. Chairman, that there are reforms to be had, evils to be uprooted, and wrongs to be righted, but woman suffrage is not the remedy.

A few years ago in New Orleans there was an epidemic of yellow fever. The people busied themselves to protect the surrounding territory from the spread of the disease. They expended a great deal of energy and money fumigating the mails. They cut holes in the envelopes inclosing letters and put some kind of powders in them, and sent them on their way, perfectly satisfied that they had done the thing that would prevent the spread of yellow fever. But it was soon found that fumigating the mails did not prevent the spread of yellow fever. The physicians who knew told the people that the evil was in the mosquito; that the mosquito carried the germ, and that the people fumigating the mails were being bitten themselves and inoculated with the germs of yellow fever. It was suggested that if they wanted to remove the cause of yellow fever they should go down and ditch off the low marshy places or pour kerosene oil upon the little lakes and lagoons. The men and women who were fumigating the mails and thought they were destroying the yellow-fever germs were as enthusiastic and zealous as these misguided woman-suffrage advocates, who imagine that placing the ballot in the hands of woman and additional duties and responsibilities upon the women of the country will be the panacea for all our political evils. If men have failed in their political obligations to the good women of the country,

let us see to it that they perform that duty, and by all means let us refuse to allow the men to shirk their political responsibility and shift it to shoulders that God Almighty never intended should bear it.

Mr. Chairman, I rejoice that, so far as I am able to ascertain, the women of the South are not in favor of woman suffrage. The great body of our women who love their husbands, their children, and their homes, and the daughters who love their parents and respect parental authority, still believe that the home is the most sacred and important institution in the United States. [Applause.] Nearly all of the white women of Alabama are opposed to woman suffrage. I have had a number of letters from the good women of the State, commending my course and urging me to continue my opposition to woman suffrage, saying that when I did so I was representing the modest, home-loving women of Alabama.

I am aware of the fact that there are a few good women in this movement, women who believe that they are doing the right thing in advocating woman suffrage, but they are mistaken. Peter believed that he was doing the right thing, and he was earnest and honest in what he did when he drew his sword and cut off the ear of the enemy of Christ, but when Jesus said to him, "Peter, put off thy sword," he realized that he was doing the wrong thing. So we are not always doing the right and proper thing when we have an impulse that suggests that we are. When I heard these women pleading for the ballot, asking to have and exercise that political weapon that men alone should wield, whose exercise by women generally would in the long run do incalculable injury to the womanhood of America—injure the home, create sex antagonism, and destroy sex sentiment—I said: "Ladies, let me beseech you to cease your advocacy of woman suffrage. It will bring harm to women generally and injuriously affect the American home." Marie Corelli has said truly that woman by the natural heritage of her sex has powers to persuade, enthrall, and subjugate man, and that she has no business mixing in his political affairs. Every good woman controls somebody's vote now. So, Mr. Chairman, if you give to woman the ballot, she will have two votes, and I am opposed to any one person having two votes. My advice to these young ladies who have been induced by their older female friends to come here and advocate woman suffrage is not to expend their time seeking the vote, but to go out and seek the voter.

Mrs. Benton McMillin, of Tennessee, the wife of ex-Governor McMillin, when asked if she did not want to vote, smilingly said: "No; I prefer to have the voter."

Yesterday a young lady appeared before this committee and made a statement in opposition to woman suffrage. She is a working girl. Some people have tried to leave the impression that whenever a girl has to go out and labor in the industrial world, she is immediately inoculated with the virus of woman suffrage and wants to wield the ballot like a man; but this young lady—a representative of the young women who toil for a living, God bless them—said: "We do not want the ballot. Voting is the duty and office of the men." That is what she said in substance, and she added: "Votes for women will not give us better wages." As Miss Ida Tarbell says, "This is an economical and not a political question." She concluded by saying, "Let the men have better wages so that they can marry the girls and

give them homes." She is right about it. I would like to see all these girls marry and leave the crowded workshops to the men, and with their industry, grace, and charm make their husbands happy.

Mr. Chairman, I have an abiding faith in the womanhood of America, and I believe in the manhood of my country, and I assert in this presence that the sons and brothers, husbands and fathers of American women can be trusted to inaugurate policies and enact laws for the good of both men and women. One woman suffragist in New York State said long ago, "We have achieved everything that we have fought for in this State, except the ballot," and I said, "My good lady, your argument is conclusive against the woman-suffrage movement. You do not need the ballot." If the women can get what they want without the ballot, and every sensible man knows that they can, why should they be burdened with the ballot and drawn into the turmoil and strife of politics? I believe it was Themistocles who said, "Greece rules the world, Athens rules Greece, I rule Athens, and my wife rules me."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the creation of a woman suffrage committee in the House, in the first place, because the question as to who shall or shall not exercise the privilege of voting is one purely and wholly, singly, and solely, for the State. I do not expect that such a committee will be created, but if it should be what would happen? Immediately the Representatives from the woman suffrage States would clamor for positions on that committee. The same thing would happen in the House that has happened in the Senate. The committee in the Senate is largely composed of the friends of woman suffrage who happen to hail from the States that have woman suffrage. Why create this committee and worry Congress with something that it has no jurisdiction over whatever? Let these people know once and for all that they must fight this question out in the States, because it pertains to and affects the vital life of the States.

Mr. Chairman, since I spoke in the Baptist Church at Falls Church, Va., last February, I have received more than 500 letters from women in various sections of the country commending my course and indorsing my utterances. I have many letters from women in woman-suffrage States, and I learned about the workings of woman suffrage from them. Some of them have said that woman suffrage was a failure, and that mixing and mingling in politics was not good for women. I thought of what Judge Davis, of West Virginia, said to me. A lady said to the judge, "Judge, we are going to do great things for politics." He smiled and said: "Not what you will do for politics, but what politics will do for you is the thing that worries me."

One of the letters that I received from California stated that the suffragettes would make war on me because I had dared to speak my convictions concerning woman suffrage. She said a public man in that State who opposed woman suffrage was insulted by some of the suffragettes who attended his public speakings, that they called him all sorts of names; among other things they mildly accused him of being an ignoramus and an old fool. She said they will be bitter against you, because you have dared to oppose them. She went on to say that women in her community who had been lifelong friends had become estranged on account of political differences. They

quit speaking to each other on account of politics. This is one of the fruits of woman suffrage in a woman-suffrage State; and the Bible says, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage has as its chairman Senator Thomas, of Colorado, a very clever gentleman. It is told of him that shortly after woman suffrage prevailed in Colorado he made a speech at a banquet, in which he said: "Here's to the ladies of Colorado, once our superiors, but now our equals."

I am opposed to anything that will make men effeminate and women masculine. The more modest and gentle a woman is the more she appeals to the manly man. Mr. Chairman, it is unjust and unfair to the great body of American women for Members of Congress to undertake to thrust upon them political burdens that they do not ask for and do not desire. Look at these good women here from the North and the South protesting against any movement that will drag woman out of the sphere where God in His wisdom has placed her; they protest against the effort that seeks to make political beings of the home makers and home preservers of America, and, Mr. Chairman, these women are not professional lecturers and agitators. They are the representatives of the modest, gentle women of the country. They are not seeking notoriety, but are striving modestly and earnestly to do that which is best for the home and the country.

Some women have failed to manage their own children and now want an opportunity to manage full-grown men. Some of them have failed to run the home, are now running away from the home, and want to run the State.

Mr. Chairman, when the good lady from Ohio spoke of her seven daughters and two sons I thought of our family of eight boys and one girl; and I want to say in this connection that I have four unmarried brothers, eligible to the high office of matrimony. Let four daughters of this Ohio mother take notice. That is the sort of suffrage I believe in. This good Ohio mother in her talk intimated very strongly that some of these political women were drifting far away from their duties as women and neglecting things far more important than obtaining the ballot.

Mr. Chairman, in the Smithsonian Institution there are a great many things of interest. They have on exhibition there a section of a tree that contains a hollow place. In that hollow place is the nest of the female hornbill bird. The stuffed male bird is sitting on a limb just above the nest holding a wild plum in his mouth, and the female bird has her mouth up to the little hole in the clay wall which the male bird has built around her. I asked the guide why the clay wall was there, and he said that the female would lay the eggs, but that she would not remain on the nest to hatch them, and that the male bird caught her on the nest and built that clay wall that shuts her in and compels her to remain on the nest until she hatches the eggs. There are no American women who want to get away from home and home duties—no unnatural mothers who would fail to do their duty by their children. None, I presume, who would like to throw off the restraining influences that say to them, So far shalt thou go and no farther. I make no application of the hornbill bird. I simply relate the incident because I happened to recall it at this time.

When the sons of Eli were engaged in war with the Philistines they had violated every command of the Almighty. They went out to battle and the Philistines overcame them, and they lost several thousand men. And then what did the sons of Eli do? Did they go back and ask the God of the covenant to be with them and bless them in their undertakings against the Philistines? Did they inquire if there was anything necessary for them to do in order to obtain favor in the sight of the God of their father? No; they said, "Let us go up into Shiloh and get the ark of the covenant and take that with us into the next battle, and when the Philistines see us bearing it aloft they will flee and the victory will be ours"; but they were mistaken. The God of the covenant was not with them, and the Philistines overcame the sons of Eli again and captured the ark itself. Some of these good women seem to think that all that they need to do is to go up and get the ballot and rush with it into the political arena; that political evils will flee before it and all will be well in the Republic. But be not deceived, my good women. Some of you need to expend your energies along other lines—go back to first principles and re-consecrate your hearts, your strength, and your all to the duties of the sphere in which God in His wisdom has placed you. Some of these women do not seem to realize that they, like the sons of Eli, have failed in their duty somewhere, and that many of the evils that now afflict us do not spring from political conditions but from home conditions. The power to correct these evils lies in the hands of the modest gentlewomen of America. They must and will correct them; not with the ballot, not as a man would but as a woman would, in a woman's way. In her own sweet way she can move upon men and speak through them purifying politics and driving evil of every kind from the country.

You can not by constitutional amendment and statutory enactment change God's edict concerning man and woman. They have their separate and distinct functions to perform according to their powers and limitations in the eternal fitness of things. You may legislate till doomsday and you can not change the Almighty's decree regarding sex. You can not legislate into man the intuition of woman any more than you can transfer to the throat of the English sparrow the melodious notes of the nightingale. That condition which makes women want to do like men and men want to do like women in ways contrary to nature is fraught with grave danger to our country. The masculine woman and the effeminate man are an abomination to any land.

Mr. Chairman, this woman-suffrage movement violates the very preamble of the Federal Constitution, because that preamble says, among other things, that we ordain and establish this Constitution, etc., "in order to insure domestic tranquillity"; and there will be no more domestic tranquillity in this Nation if woman suffrage comes. No more "Home, sweet home"; no more lullabies to the baby; the husband will hold to one political view and the wife will cling to another; domestic tranquillity will be flung to the four winds, and pandemonium will reign in many quarters of the country. But one suffragette said, "Why, the woman would vote with her husband." All right; let us analyze that situation briefly. Mr. Chairman, if you and your wife should vote against me and my wife, that would be two votes against two; and if our wives did not vote, and you and

I should vote against each other, that would be one vote against the other, and the result would be the same. So we have accomplished no good by thrusting the ballot upon woman, and she has had additional responsibilities to bear. But another woman-suffrage advocate says, "The wife would not vote as her husband does; she would vote against him." If that is true you would have a house divided against itself, and the Bible says "a house divided against itself can not stand." Some of these suffragettes do not like to hear much about the Bible. That old-fashioned Book, like a good many dear and sacred old-fashioned things, has ceased to be interesting with many of them, and, Mr. Chairman, if we get universal woman suffrage I fear that we will lose much with its coming and "long for the touch of a vanished hand and the sound of a voice that is still," the voice of gentle, lovely, modest womanhood.

The keynote of all the talks made by these good women opposed to woman suffrage is and has been: Women, beware of this woman-suffrage movement. You will surrender more than you will ever gain by its possession, and when you realize what you have lost and the price that you have paid you will feel like the atheist who said, "I did not know what I was giving up. I would give the world for the old faith."

If the women of America could express themselves on this question of woman suffrage it would be overwhelmingly defeated. In no State where woman suffrage obtains have ever a majority of the women voted. What more proof is necessary to show that a majority of women do not believe in woman suffrage? I do not believe that there is a State in the Union where a majority of the women want to vote, and I do not believe that there is a State in the Union where woman suffrage would carry by popular vote. I am going to print in this connection what another says about woman suffrage:

I have yet to see a maid in love, with any prospects of matrimonial success; I have yet to see a woman with a kindly, sympathetic face and low, sweet voice clamoring for female enfranchisement. The woman who can transform an humble cabin into a happy home, gilded with God's own glory, who can rule her husband in her own sweet way, and rear a crop of boy babies fit to wear the crown of American sovereignty, never imagines that the country is going to the bowwows if she does not get the ballot.

I verily believe that a campaign in Colorado and California would cause those States to decide against woman suffrage, and I verily believe that a majority of the women there would vote to do away with it. I heard a story the other day concerning one of the woman-suffrage States. A man and his wife were both summoned to serve on the jury. The man sat in the rear of the court room and seemed somewhat nervous and embarrassed when the clerk called his name. The judge said: "Mr. Jones, have you and reason to give why you should not serve on the jury this week?" He looked mournfully at the judge and said: "Judge, I see my old lady has been chosen to serve on the jury, and by golly I have jest naturally got to go home and look after the babies." I want to say to these good women who came here to protest against having the ballot thrust upon them, You are contributing more to the moral uplift and good government than you ever could by having and wielding the ballot.

You who talked here yesterday with so much feeling and earnestness about woman's mission and the American home, the care and

training of children—your timidity and modest bearing, the kindly expressions of your faces, and the very tone of your soft, sweet voices carried us back to home, sweet home. You created here a wholesome and pleasing atmosphere and made a lasting impression on all who heard you. You made us think more of and love better that most important of all our institutions, the American home, and in your very presence womanhood was exalted and the modest, consecrated, home-loving woman—far from the fret and the fever of politics—stood out in all her grace and glory, man's good angel, his strength and inspiration in all the walks of life.

You good women and those for whom you speak are the very soul and inspiration of all that is best in man. You are the conservators and guardians of the dearest heritage of the human race. To you and to those like you the country must look for its strength and inspiration in all the years to come. You are rendering a great service to your day and generation, and your modest, solemn plea in behalf of the women and the home will ring around this Republic like a trumpet call. I saw tears in the eyes of strong men yesterday as you pleaded for the separation of women from politics, as you spoke of home, husband, wife, children, and mother. I want to say to you that in my judgment four-fifths of the Members of the House of Representatives are against woman suffrage. I believe that nine out of every ten men in the country—yes, and women too—are against woman suffrage.

Mr. Chairman, every man in the world who has accomplished anything is the flesh-and-blood representative of some good woman. She was the inspiration and hers the guiding hand that led him up the rugged paths of youth to the plains of a splendid manhood. There are grave political problems to solve; but, thank God, the sons born of American mothers can solve them. The work of the wife and the mother in the home is the most important of all work. Church government and State government derive their strength and glory from family government, and when the wife and mother, sister and daughter contribute of their soul wealth to the well-being of the male members of the family, bestowing upon them that which makes for beauty, strength, and nobility of character, they are rendering the highest service that it is possible for a human being to render in this world.

Astronomers tell us that the sun and moon are distinctly different; but that the work of both is essential to the life all around us. They both have to do with and influence the vital life of the universe. Distinctly different and yet harmoniously cooperative they go their appointed ways performing their separate and distinct functions according to their powers and limitations in the eternal fitness of things. It is said that the sun is indispensable and performs a mighty work; that stars and planets are held in place by his majesty in power; and that seasons come and go at the beck and call of the moon. Mild mannered and modest as she is, she sways the mighty waters of the deep, and makes old ocean leap and laugh, responsive to her will. Mr. Chairman, I have seen the moon in the eastern sky in the afternoon before the sun went down; but she did not seem to be envious or jealous of the king of day. She did not evidence any desire to antagonize or usurp his kindly functions; but modestly waited until he journeyed down the western sky and

entered his star-graveled palace in the west. And then from her eastern summit she smiled gloriously and shed her soft, silvery light on a beautiful world below. When she waves her silvery scepter flowers yield their rich perfume, the dewdrop laughs on the lily's cheek, and the night-blooming cereus unfold their blossoms to the breeze, and mocking birds and the nightingales pour out their souls in song. A modest, beautiful lassie and a handsome, manly laddie, mellow moonlight, a bower of roses and love's young dream, this is the highway that leads to the kind of suffrage that I believe in.

God made man and woman distinctly different, with separate and distinct functions to perform according to their powers and limitations in the eternal fitness of things. Man is the stronger physically, and is the bold, aggressive, governing power. Woman is the smaller physically, and is the gentle, conservative, refining power. Man is the unit of power in the political world, and woman is the unit of power in the social world.

Mr. Chairman, in the Constitutional Convention of the United States the question arose as to the qualifications of voters. It was advocated by some that there should be one general standard fixed by the Federal Government, but the wise men of that convention did not believe that the Federal Government ought to have that power. Benjamin Franklin led the opposition to the Federal idea, and he declared that the State and the State alone should say who shall or shall not have and exercise the ballot. That doctrine became the fixed policy of the Government, and has been handed down to us. The State and the State alone has the right to speak on this question. Let this committee refuse to do anything that will cause conflict between the separate and distinct functions of State and Federal Government. Let this committee go on record as standing firmly and strongly by the States in the full and free exercise of the sovereign power vouchsafed unto them by the framers of the Constitution and the founders of this Government. Let the State grow and develop within its prescribed constitutional powers and limitations until she reaches that high destiny fashioned for her by the fathers of the Republic. Unhampered and unhindered by perverted Federal power, bid her godspeed and onward as she performs her distinct high mission in the household of sovereign States.

Aristotle has said truly that man is by nature a political animal. Dr. J. W. Lee has said that the germ of government is in the man as the germ of the oak is in the acorn. Mr. Gladstone has said that the American Constitution is the greatest civic production that ever emanated from the brain of man. Faithful to the doctrine of the old Bible and true to the teachings of the new, our fathers founded this Government upon the family as the unit of political power, with the husband as the recognized and responsible head. Under this splendid system we have marvelously progressed materially, socially, politically, and religiously. Born but a little more than a century ago into the family of nations, we are to-day the most enlightened and best ruled Government on the globe. Why, then, should we abandon this system of Government that has brought us peace, prosperity, and happiness unparalleled among the nations of the earth?

But they tell us that women are as intelligent as men, and therefore should vote because men do. The fact is some women are more intelligent than some men, but that is no reason that they should

vote. A woman may be as intelligent as an engineer and she may be able to run an engine just as he can; but that is no reason why she should do so, and no man wants to see her do that work. It may be that she can fell the trees in the forests and tunnel the mountains through which railroad trains must run, but no man wants to see her perform that work. As one star differs from another star in glory, so man differs from woman in power and in right to rule in the political world. God Almighty had a purpose in making man and woman different. They have separate and distinct functions to perform, and whenever you confuse the one with the other you run counter to the plans of nature and injure both men and women.

Miss Annie Bock has said truly: "The child has the right to have one parent from which to inherit the finer qualities of being." And the nobler, finer qualities of the man are inherited from his mother. The nobler traits and the finer qualities of being come from the treasure house of feminine charm and sweetness. They are filtered through the finer sensibilities of the female soul. The perfume of the flower, the tint of the rose, and the glory of the lily come not from the boisterous breath of the storm god, but in dancing sunbeams, mellow moonlight, and distilled dewdrops that fall in the silent watches of the night. So, my friends, the mother service is the unheard whisper that speaks aloud in human character. The echoes of that gentle tongue have reached the highest peak and her smile has shed a radiance in the lowliest cabins of earth. God bless you good women in your efforts to protect and safeguard American womanhood.

Mr. Chairman, I deny that the great body of home-loving women in this country are ready to repudiate their sons, brothers, husbands, and fathers and join in this wild clamor for female suffrage. I deny that the good women of this country are ready to give up their home duties—duties that nobody else can perform—to enter upon this trying and hazardous road of politics. I pray God that the center of gravity may never pass over from the gentle effeminate side of lovely woman's nature to the unnatural side that clamors for the noise and excitement of politics. I am fighting for woman and the American home—fighting for the highest and best interest of children yet unborn.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, our country has prospered as no other country on earth. We are the only nation whose highest judicial authority has declared it to be a Christian nation. We are the only nation that sets apart a day of thanksgiving to God. Our hills and valleys are dotted with churches and institutions of learning, and "we are the heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time." Through all this marvelous growth and development woman has spoken, not from the hustings with a ballot in her hand, but from the fireside with a baby at her knees. Paraphrasing in part the language of another, if the time should ever come when religion is driven from the courts and capitols of the country, from all designated places of public worship, its last retreat will be the fireside; its last altar place a woman's heart, and its last lovely scene an infant at her knee as she teaches him to lisp the eternal name of God. The mother service is the highest and noblest service in all the world. She contributes both sons and daughters to the commonwealth and

the country. Her sons support civil government in time of peace and fight for its preservation in time of war. Her daughters keep the fires of maternal love forever burning on the hearthstone. They are the golden links in the endless chain of the Almighty's plan to bless the world with beings whom God has in his image made.

Mr. Chairman, I shall print in this connection some of the letters and documents to which I have referred:

WOMAN'S SPHERE.

Woman's sphere—or is it her hemisphere—is bounded on the east by the fixed laws of nature, on the north by the chilling conventionalities of man's approval or disapproval, on the west by the boundless sea of feminine possibilities, and on the south by her individual activity, ambition, and emotion. The fact remains that she has ever been and ever will be the mother of the race. She is the maker, the reproducer in nature's workshop; around her centers the continuity of the race, the unity of the family, the possibility of society.

The great fact of motherhood and home remain the most beautiful and wonderful facts of the universe.

As the woman, so is the home; and out of the home are the issues of life and death both for nations and individuals.—Mrs. R. B. McSwain, in *Christian Advocate*, May, 1913.

WOMAN.

If a woman has not learned to be faithful in the few things committed to her as a woman, in home making, training these at the fireside by precept and example to be honest, truthful, industrious, and law-abiding, how can she walk out and cast a wisp of paper, called "a vote," into a ballot box and do it; how can she rely upon others keeping "law" that she votes into a statute, when she herself spurns God's feminine law.

The fundamental school of instruction is the home, for therein is the lever to uplift the world; its handle rests in woman's hands, or in her hands to drag it down into godless desolation.

The great masterpieces of character which have enobled the world have been chiseled by God's hand through His ordained medium, the "mother."

LIDA B. ROBERTSON.

MOBILE, ALA.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Suffrage robs women of all that is gentle, tender, and attractive.

On the good intelligent woman in the home, rearing her children with a sense of responsibility and duty, depends the welfare of the Nation. The struggle, strife, contention, bitterness, heart burnings, excitement, agitation, disappointment of politics are not for women. A child has a right to have one parent from whom to inherit the finer qualities of being.

LOS ANGELES, CAL.

MISS ANNIE BOCK.

LEXINGTON, MASS.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I note in the Boston Globe of February 10 an account of your address at Falls Church, Va., and I wish to thank you both for myself and the many women in and around Boston for your words in behalf of us who are contented to remain in the sphere of life where God in his wisdom has placed us.

And we feel that we can safely leave the government of the country to the men of the home.

May there be found in the present Congress many like yourself, who will vote and speak for the modest, refined, home-loving women who do not wish suffrage thrust upon them.

I hope to again see accounts of your words in our behalf.

Cordially,

A MOTHER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 10, 1913.

MY DEAR MR. HEFLIN: May I offer congratulations on the common-sense talk you gave yesterday to the Virginia women. If you could make such a sermon nation wide you would receive the gratitude of a very large number of American women. Millions of men feel as you do, but from some mistaken sense of chivalry or courtesy they do not come out in the open and put forth their beliefs.

What we stay-at-home women resent is not only the spectacle our sex is making of itself but a stirring up of discontent among the element who stand ready to follow any distraction which promises excitement or a chance for woman to flaunt herself in the public eye. The larger part of the pageant being planned represents this spirit of unrest and a desire to be conspicuous far more than any vaunted ambition to help "the downtrodden sisterhood" or to benefit posterity. Indeed, hundreds of women have not the vaguest ideas possible of what they could do with a vote if they got it.

I am not enrolled with the antisuffragists. I am merely a woman content with my lot, and there is a vast majority of women who feel exactly as I do—a much larger majority, let me tell you, than the suffragists care to enumerate. We are the class who are perfectly satisfied with the rights we now possess, realizing that they are quite sufficient for the average woman to cope with.

We ask nothing except to be let alone and not be pestered as we have been in this city during the past few weeks with requests to join a movement which does not only draws on our sympathy but repels us, because of its spectacular and almost idiotic features.

Although the importunities to which we listen day after day are little but passing irritation, there is one thing that women who feel as I do object to most strongly. That is the manner in which suffrage is being thrashed out in our schools. Feminine teachers seem to be for it, boys and girls debate the question, and children who come from homes where the topic is rampant exert more than a momentary influence.

I have a 15-year-old daughter, and I know of what I speak. Every mother possesses the right to shape the mind of her own child on such a subject as this; besides, it scarcely comes within the latitude of education, and there is certainly enough in the school curriculum without it.

I hope that you and other men who stand where you do will exert the courage of your convictions as outspokenly as you did yesterday. Women can not stem the tide of unroarious emotion which is sweeping the country. Such a power lies in the hands of men who hold the places in the affairs of the Nation and men who dare to exercise their power will gain the gratitude and respect of a large multitude of women.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My mother asks me to send her congratulations to you for your attitude on the votes-for-women proposition. As the oldest living descendant of the mother of Patrick Henry, Sarah Winston Henry, who gave three sons to the cause of the Revolution and who never heard of sex emancipation and would not have listened to it, she has the right to express an opinion on matters concerning her country's welfare. Mother says that you struck the nail most squarely on the head when you said that many of the suffragettes were the products of unhappy homes.

With many thanks for your good work in this matter, I am,
Yours, sincerely,

JEAN CABELL O'NEIL.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

JUDGE ADAMS, OF GEORGIA.

Did space permit I would like to quote, for the benefit of the sincere advocates of this movement, the words of eminent men who at one time were inclined to favor the movement, and who, upon more mature reflection, repudiated it. Horace Bushnell, for example, spoke in strong terms his final word on the subject, concluding with these words, "It is a reform against nature."

John Bright, Herbert Spencer, Gladstone, and Bishop Vincent have all done the same thing. Spencer, in his "Justice," renounced his former position, having found that there were fundamental reasons for keeping the spheres of the

sexes distinct and separate. He had once advocated the movement from "the point of view of a general principle of individual rights," but he finds this is not sustainable, as he "discovers mental and emotional differences between the sexes which disqualify women for the burden of government and the exercise of its functions."

Bishop Vincent, the founder of the Chautauqua, says on this subject, "When about 30 years of age I accepted for a time the doctrine of woman suffrage and publicly defended it. Years of wide and careful observation have convinced me that the demand for woman suffrage in America is without foundation in equity, and if successful must prove harmful to American society."

"I find some worthy women defending it, but the majority of our best women, especially our most intelligent, domestic, and godly mothers, neither ask for nor desire it. The instinct of motherhood is against it. The basal conviction of our best manhood is against it. The movement is at root a protest against the representative relations and functions by virtue of which each sex depends upon and is exalted by the other. This theory and policy, tending to the subversion of the natural and divine order, must make man less a man and woman less a woman."

A distinguished woman advocate of this suffrage movement says: "We need the ballot to protect us against men." When one sex is compelled to thus protect itself against the other the foundations of society are already crumbling.

Woman now makes man what he is. She controls him as babe, boy, manly son, brother, lover, husband, father. Her influence is enormous. If she use it wisely, she needs no additional power. If she abuse her opportunity, she deserves no additional responsibility. Her womanly weight, now without measure, will be limited to the value of a single ballot and her control of from two to five additional votes forfeited.

The curse of America to-day is in the dominated partisan vote—the vote of ignorance and superstition. Shall we help matters by doubling this dangerous mass? Free from the direct complications and passions of the political arena, the best women may exert a conservative and moral influence over men as voters. Force her into the same bad atmosphere and both men and women must inevitably suffer incalculable loss. We know what woman can be in the "commune," in "riots," and on the "rostrum."

Woman can, through the votes of men, have every right to which she is entitled. All she has man gladly gave her. It is his glory to represent her. To rob him of his right is to weaken both. He and she are just now in danger through his mistaken courtesy. Much more could be added on this same line.

If the public work is ill done by men, the remedy is to do it better, not to shift the weight to shoulders already heavy laden and whose task they do not propose in any respect to lighten.

I regret to see women engage in the movement because it indicates a failure to discern the natural place of woman in the order of creation, the place of eternal supremacy and superiority.

I conclude with the words of Tennyson:

"Woman is not undeveloped man,
But diverse. Could we make her as the man
Sweet love were slain, whose dearest bond is this:
Not like to thee, but like indifference."

SAMUEL B. ADAMS.

SAVANNAH, GA., November 26, 1913.

COLORADO WOMEN.

Let me read to you what some of our good women say on the subject:

I can see nothing that it has accomplished in its 16 years here that has not been done equally in other States where they have no woman's suffrage. Our political "ring" remains as corrupt as ever, and the addition of women's votes in the down-town districts has been only to double its purchasable vote. I believe that there is a growing feeling that the whole thing has been a mistake, and that it would be a great relief to be relieved of the responsibility.

Mrs. CHALONER E. SCHLEY.

COLORADO SPRINGS.

In our statehouse I have seen suffragists yell, jump, and slap each other on the back like men, and to my mind the most convincing argument is to go to the statehouse and see the two bodies of people, suffragists and antisuffragists. Colorado, where franchise is given to women, is the greatest divorce State in our country.

H. EDNA WHITTIER.

LEXINGTON, MASS.

I am sure that I voice the opinion of a large percentage of Colorado women when I make the statement that we should be glad to see the franchise withdrawn.—Mrs. E. B. Field, jr., Denver Colo., in the Ladies' Home Journal, April, 1911.

I feel I was in a measure instrumental in bringing suffrage in California, and I want to tell you that if I had it to do over again I would work twice as hard against it.

It is the constant agitation of the same few going about the country that keeps the question before the public and leads some to think the desire for it is general.

Miss ANNIE BOCK.

A MODERN WOMAN'S SOLILOQUY.

To vote, or not to vote; that is the question:
Whether 'tis nobler in a woman to tolerate
The humiliation and injustice of unequal suffrage,
Or to take arms against existing conditions,
And, by opposing, end them? To win, to vote,
Ever more; and by our vote to say we end
The corruption and the thousand present evils
That politics is heir to; 'tis a consummation
Devoutly to be wished. To win, to vote;
To vote! perchance 'twere ruin; ay there's the rub;
For in domestic conditions what change may come,
When we have turned our attention to politics,
Must give us pause; there's the respect
That makes us hesitate to demand our rights;
For who would bear the trials and worries of dependence,
The "trust's" oppression, the proud man's condescension,
The high cost of living, the law's delay,
The incompetence of officers, and the taxes
That unrepresented woman has to pay,
When she herself might these things remedy
With a mere vote? Who would troubles bear,
To toil and strive under such adversity,
But that the dread of something like death—
The destruction of home life, after whose ruin
No nation can survive—puzzles the will,
And makes us rather bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of?
Thus uncertainty does make cowards of us all;
And thus my natural resolution
Is weakened by this single doubt;
And from enterprises of such endeavor,
With this regard, I quickly turn away,
And lose the name of "Suffragette."

LETITIA MARSHALL.

VICKSBURG, MISS., December 29, 1913.

STATEMENT OF MISS ALICE STONE BLACKWELL, OF BOSTON, MASS.

MISS BLACKWELL. Gentlemen of the committee, it is difficult in a short time to review the arguments that have been made during nine hours. Therefore I shall take up only the most important points and not try to speak of the others at this time.

The argument has been made over and over again that you ought not to appoint this committee, because there is not a sufficient public

demand, and because the number of women who oppose it is greater than the number who favor it.

It is an actual fact that we represent a very much larger number of women than the opposition. The opponents say that only 8 per cent of the women of this country favor suffrage. They have no authority for this. Nobody knows how many there are. But it is a fact that less than 1 per cent of the women of the United States have expressed any objection to equal suffrage. Appeals have been sent out over the country for years urging all women to protest, and yet less than 1 per cent are protesting against having the suffrage "thrust upon them."

The antisuffragists claim to be organized in 17 States. The suffragists are organized in 47 States. The only State without an organization is New Mexico. Until recently South Carolina and New Mexico were the only two. South Carolina now has a number of suffrage clubs.

The antisuffrage movement maintains only three periodicals—two monthlies and one quarterly. The suffrage movement maintains seven weekly papers, one fortnightly, and four or five monthlies.

You must have noticed how much larger an attendance there was in this committee room when the suffragists made their argument than when the antisuffrage argument was presented. The experience is the same everywhere. In every State where petitions for suffrage and remonstrances against it has been sent to the legislature, the petitioners have always outnumbered the remonstrants and have generally outnumbered them 50 or 100 to 1.

At the time of the last New York constitutional convention, the suffragists obtained more than 300,000 individual signatures to their petitions. Suppose only one-half of those were women, that would make 150,000. At the same time the antisuffragists obtained only 15,000 signatures.

In Chicago, a few years ago, 104 organizations, with an aggregate membership of more than 100,000 women, petitioned for a municipal woman-suffrage clause in the new city charter, while only one small organization of women petitioned against it.

The only time an official referendum was ever taken among women on this subject was in Massachusetts 18 years ago. The antisuffragists say that only 4 per cent of the women of the State expressed themselves in favor of it. They neglect to say that less than one-sixth of 1 per cent expressed themselves opposed. The women's vote stood: Yes, 22,204; no, 861. When the referendum was first ordered leading antisuffragists circulated among women pledged to vote "no" and to get other women to vote "no." Later on they came to the conclusion that they could not get a majority of the women of Massachusetts to vote "no," and three days before the close of registration they sent out an appeal to the antisuffrage women, urging them not to register or to vote. They had always claimed that when they were given the right to vote they would feel under a moral obligation to use it. They went back upon all their professed principles rather than reveal the fewness of their numbers by standing up to be counted. They did their best to keep the legislature and the public from finding out how many women really were opposed. They preferred to "lie low" and let the few women who decidedly objected be confused with the much larger number who did not care.

We admit that there are many who do not care. But of those who do care the vast majority are in favor. This has been demonstrated wherever the matter has been brought to a test.

When constitutional amendments desired by men are submitted to the voters, it is only necessary to show that more men favor the amendments than oppose them. It is not necessary to show that those who favor the amendments outnumber both those who are opposed and those who do not care.

In New York State a successful amendment to the constitution seldom gets more than 25 per cent of the male vote. The remaining 75 per cent are either indifferent or opposed; but, since less than 25 per cent are actually opposed, the amendment carries. It is not necessary and we do not think it is fair to require that the women who desire suffrage must outnumber both those who are against it and those who are indifferent. The people who demand this are giving a wholly new interpretation to "majority rule."

A great deal of the argument presented before this committee has been irrelevant; but, since the antisuffragists have wandered over the whole field, it will be necessary for us to wander after them.

One of them claimed that the majority of the grangers were opposed to suffrage. The National Grange passes a strong resolution in favor of woman suffrage every year, and a long list of State granges have done the same. Evidently the leaders of the grange are in favor of it, and there is no evidence whatever to show that the rank and file do not agree with the leaders.

Individual working women have appeared before this committee and have said they believed that the majority of working women were opposed to suffrage. But all the great organizations of working men and working women have passed strong resolutions in favor of woman suffrage. The National Woman's Trade Union League and every one of its State branches have done so, and likewise the American Federation of Labor and a long list of State federations.

We have been told that all kinds of terrible things will happen if suffrage is granted. I should like to put in as one of our exhibits a map [indicating map]. It is a map of the United States with the suffrage States marked in white. The white States take in the entire west of the country and come east as far as Illinois. With the exception of Illinois, every State that has adopted suffrage borders directly upon some other State which has it. If, as has been claimed here, homes were broken up and made desolate, if husbands found that their wives were neglecting their home duties and their children, it is not likely that suffrage would spread from the State which first adopted it to one adjoining State after another.

You have had one California woman here who claimed that suffrage in California does not work well. This afternoon you will have counter testimony from other Californians. Meanwhile I would like to call your attention to one striking fact. California adopted the initiative and referendum at the same time with suffrage. The anti-suffragists immediately started an initiative petition for the repeal of woman suffrage. They said that 80 per cent of the women of California were opposed to it, and that they would repeal it. They could easily have done it if that number had really been opposed. Both men and women were eligible to sign the repeal petitions; but out of the 1,591,783 men and women in California, they failed to get the

32,000 signatures necessary. In a single year suffrage in California had so commended itself to the people that the antisuffragists could not secure the small percentage of names required to resubmit the question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was there an effort made to circulate the petitions?

Miss BLACKWELL. Oh, yes. I have had in my hands the circular issued by the antisuffragists. They boasted that the women of California were going to repeal it.

It has been asserted that the women in all the suffrage States would like to repeal it. In any one of those States the women could repeal it if they wished.

Except in California, there has never been a serious attempt made to do it. We are told that whenever women want the suffrage they can get it. Whenever they want to repeal suffrage they can repeal it.

It has been said that in the enfranchised States there is "a great contest of opinion" as to whether it works well. That is a most one-sided contest. In all the suffrage States of the country put together the antisuffragists have not found a dozen respectable men, or even half a dozen, to assert, over their own names, that it has had any bad results whatever. On the other hand, long lists of the most distinguished men and women in those States testify to its good results.

A great effort was made by the editor of the Ladies' Home Journal to find Colorado women who would express themselves against woman suffrage. The fact that he wanted adverse opinions was widely announced in the Colorado papers. Out of the more than 200,000 women in Colorado he succeeded in finding 19 who said they did not think much of woman suffrage. Of these only 3 said it had done any harm. The rest merely said that it had done no good, or only a little good, or good only along certain lines. Not one claimed that it had had any such extravagantly bad results as have been prophesied before this committee.

A few years ago Mrs. Julia Ward Howe took a census of all the ministers of four leading denominations in the four oldest suffrage States—Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Idaho—and also of all the editors. She asked them whether the results of woman suffrage were good or bad. She received 624 answers, of which 62 were unfavorable, 46 on the fence, and 516 in favor. The answers from the editors were favorable, more than 8 to 1; those from the Episcopal clergymen more than 2 to 1; from the Baptist ministers, 7 to 1; from the Congregationalists, about 8 to 1; from the Methodists, more than 10 to 1, and from the Presbyterians, more than 11 to 1. If equal suffrage had corrupted the women, or if it had promoted those demoralizing results which the term "feminism" is said to imply, their pastors could hardly have failed to find it out.

You have been told that suffrage would be of no use to working women. While his individual ballot may not directly affect the wages of any workingman, yet if all workingmen were suddenly to be disfranchised to-morrow, would not the workers find themselves in a much weaker and more helpless position? That exact situation will apply in the case of the working women; and that is why the great organized bodies of workingmen and women have repeatedly declared for equal suffrage.

I once heard Miss Heloise Hersey, of Boston, say in a public address against woman suffrage that she believed the workingmen of America would be better off without the ballot, because then their employers would feel a sense of chivalry toward them. That is the argument against woman suffrage carried to its logical conclusion. Everyone sees that it is foolish when applied to men. The organized working women think it is equally foolish in regard to them.

We do not claim that the ballot is the only factor affecting industrial welfare, but it does have a direct influence and weight when you are trying to get better hours or better sanitary conditions. In the matter of wages it has only a more remote and indirect influence.

You have been told that when women obtain the ballot they will have to sacrifice all the great body of protective industrial legislation that has been gained for them. Against that we have the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the famous Oregon case, in which Justice Brewer wrote the opinion of the court that the limiting of women's working hours is constitutional. In that decision he took pains to say—and this is the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States—that even if the time came when women obtained the ballot and stood upon an equal level with men before the law in all other respects, nevertheless women's weaker physique and the fact that they are the mothers of the coming generation will still make necessary protective industrial legislation for them. In no State where such protective legislation had been secured for women before they got the ballot had it ever been repealed afterwards. In several States since they got the ballot they have obtained such protective legislation which they had tried in vain to secure for years before they had a vote.

In California the eight-hour law for women was passed by the same legislature that voted overwhelmingly in favor of submitting the suffrage amendment; and after equal suffrage was adopted the next legislature not only did not repeal the eight-hour law, but extended it to a larger number of occupations.

In the State of Washington the women before they had the ballot had tried for eight years to get an eight-hour law, but without success. After equal suffrage was granted, the very next legislature passed the law. In Colorado also similar legislation was passed after women got the vote. The only States that have the eight-hour law for women are suffrage States.

You have been told that they do not forbid night work. The more fully developed industrial States have more elaborate protective legislation for working women than the Western States, where comparatively few women are working outside their own homes. Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and New York, according to the census of 1909, had 635,274 women working in factories, while the four States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Idaho, all put together, had only 3,499. If a State with no factories has no legislation for factory women, it does not follow that the ballot is of no use in securing such legislation where it is needed.

You have listened to a long argument by Miss Minnie Bronson. Her statements in regard to legislation for working women have often been shown to be full of errors. Mrs. Florence Kelley and the Misses Pauline and Josephine Goldmark are recognized as authorities on the conditions of working women. All three are prominently

connected with the Consumers' League. They have written a pamphlet, reviewing Miss Bronson's argument, in which they point out a long series of inaccuracies. They say that her "statements are in many cases misleading or entirely false. The interpretation of the facts is wholly so."

Another pamphlet reviewing Miss Bronson's statements has been written by two other authorities on working women, Miss Sophonisba Breckinridge and Miss Edith Abbott, with a preface by Miss Jane Addams, and we are going to ask to be allowed to put that pamphlet in as part of our case.

Then we are told that legislation can not help social evils. Nobody believes that the millennium can be brought in by act of Congress or of a State legislature. But good or bad State government can encourage or discourage vicious conditions. We had a conspicuous illustration of this in Seattle, where the city government was notoriously in complicity with gambling and other vices. After the women got the ballot the mayor who had maintained that régime was recalled, and an entirely different city government was put in.

In the same way, in other instances, equal suffrage has sometimes made a striking change. I have never known an instance where the women's votes have made a change that was not for the better.

It has been said that women would lose their nonpartisan influence. Where women vote the questions in which they are especially interested are not questions on which the women of different parties disagree. In Colorado an effort was made to put a political board in control of the State bureau of child and animal protection. What happened? The vice chairman of the Democratic State central committee was a woman, and the vice chairman of the Republican State central committee was a woman also. The two women went together to the members of the legislature and told them that the women did not want that thing done, and they prevented it. When it is a question of securing pure food for their husband's dinner, the Democratic women and the Republican women feel just the same. The women's nonpartisan influence instead of being lost becomes a bipartisan influence in favor of these things.

Many California women worked to secure improved legislation before they got the ballot and since, and they have testified to the greater respect they now receive at the hands of legislators and the greater ease with which they get the legislation they want. It has been said that the last California Legislature passed more reform legislation than the previous legislatures had done in 25 years. Jane Addams, though she commands great influence in herself, has told how much more respectfully she and the other women in Chicago have been received since the passage of the suffrage bill, and how the various committees at the city hall at Chicago have been almost tumbling over themselves to find out what the women want. Miss Addams has also spoken of the increase of power the women have been able to bring to bear for the better disposal of Chicago's garbage. They had been trying for years, but had not been able to get adequate attention given to the matter.

The statements made to your committee by the antisuffragists contain serious errors of fact. For instance, you have been told that girls under 16 can engage in street trades in Denver. That is a delusion,

due to the fact that a bill in regard to the employment of young persons, when it went up for engrossment, had accidentally dropped out of it a clause in regard to street selling by girls under 16. There was no object in its being dropped out, because the same provision was retained in another place. Judge Lindsey says that there are no girls under 16 engaged in street trades in Denver, and that if any girls under 16 attempted it they would be immediately stopped by the juvenile court.

You have been told that woman suffrage has made no difference in regard to the temperance question. On that point we wish to submit an exhibit giving the figures from the suffrage States.

Nowhere has suffrage led to State-wide prohibition. Everywhere it has led to a large extension of no-license territory.

One of the antis has said that the liquor dealers are ceasing to oppose votes for women. This would be news to the liquor interests all over the country. If that is their attitude, it must have been a very recent change of heart. Only within the last few weeks a number of test cases have been brought by liquor dealers to have the suffrage law declared unconstitutional in Illinois, where a long list of towns have gone dry on account of the women's vote.

You are also told that American suffragists are going to branch out into militancy. A little joke of Dr. Shaw's in regard to a hatchet is quoted as authority for that statement. Dr. Shaw is strongly opposed to militancy. My own paper, the *Woman's Journal*, has again and again declared that we believe militancy to be a mistake, even in England, and that we believe it would be a still greater mistake here. Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt has been charged with intended militancy. Mrs. Catt has always been strongly opposed to it. Mrs. Catt has also been charged with wanting to do away with the Constitution, because of a remark she made during the suffrage convention here. Everbody who knows her knows that she meant that the Constitution should be revised in accordance with the methods laid down in the Constitution itself.

All the militancy in America has been by the opponents of woman suffrage. Fifty-six years ago my mother, Lucy Stone, began to advocate votes for women. In the early days she was played upon with cold water from a hose while she was speaking and eggs were thrown at Miss Anthony. You may say that that was a long time ago, but only last March you know what the hooligans did here in Washington during the woman-suffrage parade. There was antisuffrage militancy on a great scale. In Dayton, Ohio, not long ago Miss Margaret Foley was pelted with bread crusts and fragments of a banquet. In New York suffrage speakers have been assailed with snuff, paper bags of water, lemons, broken glass, and other missiles. Only a few weeks ago, at the annual meeting of the Tennessee Equal Suffrage Association, antisuffragists smashed the windows of the hall and hurled a can of dangerous and vile-smelling chemicals in among the ladies. I have no doubt the organized antisuffragists do not regard these proceedings with favor, but they have never passed any resolutions condemning them. At least half a dozen suffrage associations have passed resolutions disapproving of militancy. Moreover, all the American suffragists have declared their preference for peaceful methods in the most convincing way—by following peaceful methods and no other.

We have had six States and one Territory grant women the ballot within the last five years, and they were all won by peaceful methods. We have no temptation to resort to throwing stones at anybody. Orderly tactics are succeeding very well.

Several references have been made to Massachusetts. Those statements are seriously incorrect. The representative of the Men's Anti-suffrage League of Massachusetts, Mr. Charles Underhill, who addressed you, is one of the four candidates whom the suffragists of Massachusetts are credited with defeating. He enlarged upon the excellent character of the candidates whom the suffragists singled out for defeat. He described them as men who had voted for every good measure except suffrage. Now, their constituents did not think so. We made no campaign against the personal character of any of these men, but men who vote in a reactionary way on woman suffrage generally vote in the same way on many other questions. We took the record of their votes in the legislature to their constituents, and in every case it was the man's record which killed him.

Mr. KELLY. I desire to ask you this question: Was that regarding the attitude of the members of the Massachusetts Legislature who voted against suffrage and temperance and child-labor legislation?

Miss BLACKWELL. I should seriously question that statement. The Massachusetts House of Representatives voted almost 2 to 1 in favor of suffrage. Therefore, among the great raft of members of all sorts who voted for us, there were probably some who were opposed to child-labor legislation. Generally speaking, suffragists are more apt to be in favor of child-labor legislation than men who are opposed to suffrage.

The gentleman from Massachusetts also said that women are treated with less respect at the statehouse than they used to be. As a matter of fact, they are treated with much more respect. Only a few years ago our bill in Massachusetts received only 14 votes in the house of representatives; this year it got 144. Nothing has brought us so much increased respect as the defeat of those four prominent antisuffrage politicians, including the president of the Massachusetts Senate, who had packed a committee against suffrage. He was defeated by his bad legislative record on a whole series of questions.

You have been told that suffrage will lead to sex war. The marriage rate is just as high in suffrage States as elsewhere; in California it has shown a marked increase since the women were given the vote. There were several thousand more marriages in California last year than there were before women got this ballot. [Applause.]

In regard to feminism, it is easy to take out of their connection a few isolated sentences and say that this means so and so, which it does not really mean at all, and thus try to show that the suffragists are in favor of destroying the home. It is easy, also, to make a quotation from some ultraradical woman and to say that this represents the opinion of suffragists in general. On that same principle, we might assert that the antisuffragists are opposed to settlement work, are opposed to welfare work, and are opposed to that whole list of things which Miss Annie Bock ran over in her address before you and declared to be "either a fad or graft." Many of these antisuffrage ladies, we know, are entirely in favor of those things. Both

suffragists and antisuffragists should be judged by their official utterances in their platforms and in their official organs.

I should like to go over some of the other points that have been brought up here, but it is impossible in the length of time. I will ask leave to submit a printed argument on a number of these points, and will merely refer in closing to the subject of appointing a committee.

It is inconceivable that the appointment of a committee to consider this question and to hear arguments on both sides will strike anybody as an indorsement of woman suffrage either by the Committee on Rules or by the Democratic Party. We simply ask that we may have a fair hearing before a committee which has time to consider our question and not before a committee which has many other subjects before it and which is badly overworked. We want a committee especially appointed for this purpose in the House of Representatives such as there already is in the Senate. Various constitutional objections have been made to it, but there can be no stronger constitutional objections to such a committee in the lower House than in the upper House. The committee in the upper House has existed for years without any danger to the Constitution.

The question as to whether Congress ought to interfere with the rights of the States in the matter of suffrage will be a point for that special committee on woman suffrage to consider among the other points which will come before it. That will also be a question for Congress to consider in case the committee reports in favor of a Federal amendment.

I would also say that an amendment to the Federal Constitution is not the only suffrage measure which that committee will be asked to consider. A number of women are asking for legislation to enable women to vote for United States Senators and Representatives and for other partial measures of suffrage which they believe to be constitutional. I am not an authority on the Constitution, and I do not know about that.

MR. CAMPBELL. It has been stated here that one of the purposes in asking for this special committee was to create a sentiment throughout the country in favor of woman suffrage by showing that the Democratic Congress was in favor of woman suffrage by the creation of this committee.

MISS BLACKWELL. I do not think it can be—

MR. CAMPBELL (interposing). I was going to add: If any quiet effort ever had been made by the proponents of woman suffrage to have the resolution providing for such an amendment referred to the Committee on Election of President and Vice President by the Speaker without any question being raised that would attract the attention of the press?

MISS BLACKWELL. I do not think so; because what we demand is not that, but a special committee. We are using our influence for that. Whether it is telegraphed to the press of the country is immaterial.

MR. CAMPBELL. It is not believed that the Committee on the Judiciary would claim jurisdiction on this question if it were referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Election of President and Vice President?

MISS BLACKWELL. That is not what we want. We want to vote not only for President and Vice President but for everything else.

MR. CAMPBELL. I mean the resolution providing for a woman suffrage committee would be referred to that other standing committee.

MISS BLACKWELL. We want a special committee on the subject.

MR. CAMPBELL. That would not call for action by this committee.

MISS BLACKWELL. We want the Committee on Rules to recommend the election of a special committee in the Lower House to hear arguments on the subject of woman suffrage, and to take such action as that committee might think best in regard to reporting a measure to Congress.

MR. CAMPBELL. I want to know whether the purpose of that request is to get the advertising for woman suffrage that the creation of that committee would give?

MISS BLACKWELL. That is not my reason for asking for it. I can speak only for myself. We are glad to get any advertising we can, of course, but I think we should get quite as much advertising by your giving us a good grievance if you refuse us a committee. I think many people who do not believe in woman suffrage would say it is not fair to compel us to bring our petitions before a committee which is so overworked that it has not reported either for or against suffrage for nearly 20 years.

MR. CAMPBELL. It is not claimed that the Committee on Election of the President and Vice President is overworked.

MISS BLACKWELL. It was so claimed at our hearing. It was said that that committee was going to be hard worked with the various questions that were going to come before it during the coming year.

We have a strong preference for a special committee on woman suffrage. It has been stated that if we secure the consent of the House for the election of a special committee, we shall then urge that it shall be a favorable committee. Of course we would desire to have as many favorable members as possible, and the antisuffragists would desire to have as many unfavorable members as possible. I think the fair thing to do would be to appoint some members of both kinds.

MR. POW. Of course you understand that this Committee on Rules can only report to the House a resolution providing for the creation of a Committee on Equal Suffrage, or whatever such a committee might be called; then, if that resolution should be favorably acted on by the House, the committee would then be elected by the entire House. The custom has been for the Democratic Members of the House to choose Democratic members of the committee, and the Republican Members of the House to choose the Republican members of the committee, and the Progressive Members of the House choose the Progressive members of the committee, but, as a matter of fact, this Committee on Rules would have no authority to appoint a committee on equal suffrage. It would have to be referred to the entire House, and the committee would be elected by the entire House.

MISS BLACKWELL. All we are asking is that you will report in favor of the creation of such a committee. We are prepared to take such a committee as you give us. We are only asking for a fair committee, and we would rather have even an unfavorable committee

than none. I do not think it can be truly said that the appointment of such a committee would be a step toward the granting of suffrage to women, unless it is assumed that the arguments which would be brought before that committee would be more powerful in favor of suffrage than against it. We are simply asking you to give us a special committee, and not compel us to take our case to a committee which is heavily overworked, and which has not made a report for years in regard to suffrage. We hope you will recommend such a committee.

EMINENT OPINIONS ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Abraham Lincoln.—I go for all sharing the privileges of the Government who assist in bearing its burdens, by no means excluding women.

Jane Addams.—If woman would fulfill her traditional responsibility to her own children; if she would educate and protect from danger factory children, who must find their recreation on the street; if she would bring the cultural forces to bear upon our materialistic civilization; and if she would do it all with the dignity and directness fitting one who carries on her immemorial duties, then she must bring herself to the use of the ballot—that latest implement for self-government. May we not fairly say that American women need this implement in order to preserve the home?

Dr. Harvey W. Wiley.—If the members of the women's clubs of the Nation could vote it would not be so difficult to secure pure food and drug legislation, nor to enforce laws properly when those were enacted. The women, above all others of our population, are intensely interested in pure foods and pure drugs, because they realize how much these things mean for the happiness and welfare of the home and for the lives and health of the children and other members of the family. If woman suffrage were not desirable for any other reason, it would be worth while to have it to have better food laws and better enforcement of those we have.

Hon. Weldon B. Heyburn, United States Senator from Idaho.—The general tone of political affairs in the State has been improved since the adoption of woman suffrage. In particular, greater care is exercised in the selection of candidates for office.

Mark Twain.—If women had the ballot they would drive the corruption out. Each party would be compelled to put up its best candidates to stand any chance of winning. I would like to see the ballot in the hands of every woman.

Owen R. Lovejoy, secretary National Child Labor Committee.—My immediate reason for favoring the enfranchisement of women is that the most serious problems of the present day are industrial, and our whole industrial system is affected by the employment of women and children. Naturally the child must be regarded as a ward of the State, because he lacks strength and experience for self-direction; but no such reason exists in the case of the woman. In my judgment, child labor will be abolished and civilized standards of employment secured far quicker by the combined political action of men and women than by continuing to regard women as the incompetent recipient of legislative favors. Beyond this we can not seriously claim to believe in the principle of popular government so long as we deny to one half the people—possibly the more intelligent half—participation in the responsibilities of government.

Henry George.—The natural right of a woman to vote is just as clear as that of a man, and rests on the same ground. Since she is called on to obey the laws she ought to have a voice in making them.

Hon. John F. Shafroth, governor of Colorado.—In Colorado the principle of equal rights for women is irrevocably determined. Submit the question to those who have tried it, and scarce a corporal's guard will be found to vote against it.

G. W. Russell, chairman of the board of governors of Canterbury College, Christchurch, New Zealand.—Prior to woman's franchise the distinctive feature of our politics was finance. Legislative proposals were regarded almost entirely from the point of view (1) What would they cost? and (2) What would be their effect from a commercial standpoint? The woman's view is not pounds nor pence, but her home, her family. In order to win her vote the politicians had to look at public matters from her point of view. Her ideal was not merely money, but happy homes, and a fair chance in life for her husband, her intended husband, and her present or prospective family.

Brand Whitlock, mayor of Toledo.—I have been asked why I believe in woman suffrage. One might as well ask why I believe in the sun or the stars or the ocean. I believe that women should vote because they are women, just as I believe that men should vote because they are men.

John Stuart Mill.—To have a voice in choosing those by whom one is governed is a means of self-protection due to every one. Under whatever conditions and within whatever limits men are admitted to the suffrage there is not a shadow of justification for not admitting women under the same.

Hon. Jonathan Bourne, United States Senator from Oregon.—I am in thorough accord with the principles of woman suffrage and shall give my vote and whatever influence I may have in the advancement of the same whenever the opportunity presents itself.

Tom L. Johnson, late mayor of Cleveland.—After all, democracy is not a matter of sex any more than it is a matter of race, color, or previous condition, but a matter of people. The more perfect the recognition of the common rights of all people the more perfect and the more just the democracy. A truly enlightened and democratic form of government would, of course, recognize the equal rights of women.

Phillips Brooks.—I am in favor of woman suffrage.

Elizabeth Stuart Phelps.—With all my head and with all my heart, I believe in woman suffrage.

Hon. John W. Kingman, late judge of Supreme Court of Wyoming.—At our first election, before women voted, we had a perfect pandemonium. At the next election women voted and perfect order prevailed and has prevailed ever since. In caucus discussions the presence of a few ladies is worth more than a whole squad of police.

John Mitchell, ex-president United Mine Workers of America.—I'm in perfect harmony with the declaration of the American Federation of Labor, which has indorsed the demand that women be given the right to vote. It's a sure thing that any adult who is amenable to the laws of the country should have a voice in the making of those laws under which he or she is governed.

Hon. John V. Johnson, late governor of Minnesota.—I have repeatedly, in public and in private, declared my belief in equal suffrage. Certainly I think there can be little room for argument that the women of the United States, with their broad culture and strong sympathies, are equally entitled to every suffrage that the men of the country now enjoy.

Hon. William Hodges Mann, governor of Virginia.—In my opinion the women of Virginia will have equal suffrage within 10 years. Evolution of the democratic form of government leads irresistibly to this logical result, and, however distasteful it may be to some, we might as well face it and prepare for its coming.

Charles Edward Russell.—If we could manifest a little animation about the antique injustice that we still do to woman perhaps we should, in time, get tired of being ruled and robbed by pirates, thieves, bosses, boodlers, millionaires, swindlers, poisoners, pickpockets, railroad Senators, and other criminals. But so long as we keep out of the suffrage the element that would purify it I don't know but we get about what we deserve.

Ralph Waldo Emerson.—It is a very cheap wit that finds it so droll that a woman should vote. * * * If the wants, the passions, the vices are allowed a full vote through the hands of a half-brutal intemperate population, I think it but fair that the virtues, the aspirations should be allowed a full voice as an offset through the purest of the people.

Hon. Alva Adams, ex-governor of Colorado.—Over and above all suffrage is woman's right, and no fair, just man will deny her that right. While we may defend equal suffrage upon the ground of expediency, it is not a question of expediency but of justice.

John Quincy Adams.—The correct principle is that women are not only justified but exhibit the most exalted virtue when they enter on the concerns of their country, of humanity, and of their God.

Hon. Edward F. Dunne, ex-mayor of Chicago.—I am in hearty sympathy with the woman-suffrage movement. I think the women of Chicago are as intelligent and as much entitled to the suffrage as are the women of Denver, which city seems entirely satisfied with the practical results of woman suffrage.

Wendell Phillips.—America never gave any better principle to the world than the safety of letting every human being have the power of protection in its own hands. I claim it for woman. The moment she has the ballot I shall think the cause is won.

Right Rev. William Nielson McVickar, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Rhode Island.—I hope and pray that we may see this come to pass soon (the right of women to vote). In this fuller citizenship there is no chance that woman would unsex herself. I believe that the paths she would walk in would not only be brightened by her presence, but that they would be straightened.

Rev. W. S. Rainsford, New York.—We have admitted woman's right to property and education. It is, then, only a question of time until we admit her right to the ballot, for by it she can best protect the one and express the other.

Samuel Gompers, president American Federation of Labor.—I am for unqualified woman suffrage as a matter of human justice.

Mrs. Catharine Waugh McCulloch, justice of the peace.—The most important reason why women should have the right to vote is because they need the ballot for their own protection from crime, disease, starvation, ignorance, and manifold other dangers.

Dr. Raymond V. Phelan, of the University of Minnesota.—The woman-suffrage movement is but part of the wider movement for democracy, which, from the intellectual point of view, means education and enlightenment for all classes and conditions of humankind, and which means, from the moral point of view, social justice.

Mrs. Maud Nathan, president Consumers' League of New York.—My experience in investigating the conditions of women wage earners warrants the assertion that some of the evils from which they suffer would not exist if women had the right to place their ballots in the ballot box. In the States where women vote there is far better enforcement of the laws which protect working girls.

Hon. Samuel J. Barrows, national prison commissioner.—Questions of philanthropy are more and more forcing themselves to the front in legislation. Women have to journey to the legislature at every session to instruct members and committees at legislative hearings. Some day we shall think it absurd that women who are capable of instructing men how to vote should not be allowed to vote themselves. If police and prison records mean anything, they mean that, considered as law-abiding citizens, women are ten times as good as men.

Rev. Thomas Scully.—The opposition to female suffrage is a matter of course. All great social and political reforms, as well as religious ones, have always been resisted by prejudices, customs, and the old cry of "inopportune." So it is with this. It is a battle—reason and justice opposed by senseless fears and selfish notions. The cause is just. It may be defeated to-day, but never conquered, and to-morrow it will be victorious.

Hon. H. B. Anthony, Rhode Island.—When we seriously attempt to show that a woman who pays taxes ought not to have a voice in the manner in which the taxes are expended, that a woman whose property and liberty and person are controlled by the laws should have no voice in framing those laws, it is not easy. If women are fit to rule in monarchies, it is difficult to say why they are not qualified to vote in a republic.

Frances E. Willard.—If prayer and womanly influence are doing so much for God by indirect methods, how shall it be when that electric force is brought to bear through the battery of the ballot box?

Hon. McKenzie Cleland, judge of the municipal court of Chicago.—If ever there was a time when we needed the sympathetic touch of woman in our laws, it is to-day. If ever there was needed in the affairs of state that unselfish genius which has ever been the peculiar endowment of womankind, it is now. Florence Nightingale with her lamp going from cot to cot in the hospital at Scutari, bringing comfort and cheer and hope, is but a picture of woman with the ballot.

Oliver Schreiner.—I have never regarded the desire (now as widespread as civilization itself) that woman should take her share in the duties and labors of the national life as in any sense a movement of the sexes against each other, but rather as a great integrative movement of the sexes toward each other.

Prof. William T. Harris, late United States Commissioner of Education.—Just as woman in literature, both as authoress and as audience, has effected a radical reform, an elimination of the obscenity and harshness from literature and art, so woman in the state will avail to eliminate the rigors of law, and much of the corruption in politics that now prevails.

William Dean Howells.—In my opinion, suffrage for women is bound to come. There are many arguments against it, but no reasons.

Rev. B. F. Crary, former presiding elder of the Methodist Episcopal churches in northern Colorado and Wyoming.—Liquor sellers and gamblers are unanimous in cursing woman suffrage.

Prof. John Graham Brooks, president National Consumers' League.—By nothing have we been more deluded and blinded than by the traditional interpretation of what politics means. It is really something very simple. People are everywhere finding out that their single strength is too weak. They have to group themselves and make certain regulations for protection; and that is politics. Are women less concerned than men in having clean streets, decent sewers, untainted milk, good schools, charities properly administered, hospitals put on a proper footing? Yet we can not have to do with any of these things without taking part in politics, pure and simple.

Louise Collier Wilcox.—I believe that until women win legal and political equality, civilization is and must remain practically at a standstill. No honorable and disinterested woman has a right to shirk any longer the moral obligation laid upon her to assume her responsibility as a citizen in the framing of public opinion and the making of the laws under which she shall live.

Hon. George E. Chamberlain, ex-governor of Oregon.—I hope that this State will give women the ballot, and I hope that every State will do it.

Hon. Lyman U. Humphrey, ex-governor of Kansas.—The vote of the women has increased at each election, and it is a factor in securing purer and better municipal government.

Norman Haggood, editor of Collier's.—I believe the participation of women in municipal elections would be likely to result in political improvement directly by increasing the amount of attention given to fundamental moral, economic, and human considerations, and thereby decreasing the rule of mere partisanship and office-seeking.

Laura Clay, Kentucky.—The forward movement of either sex is possible only when the other moves also.

Henry M. Teller, former United States Senator from Colorado.—Woman suffrage has resulted in nothing that is objectionable, and in much that is advantageous.

Hon. Frank W. Hunt, late governor of Idaho.—Woman suffrage in Idaho purifies politics. The woman vote has compelled not only State conventions, but more particularly county conventions of both parties to select the cleanest and best material for public office.

John Spargo.—In the great Empire State of the greatest Republic in history, the present woman is still politically on a level with the vilest criminal and the most driveling imbecile. Woman is bound to the mound of the debris of all the ages—the debris of false conventions, outworn lies, and useless labors. By a senseless servitude to useless things she is prevented from giving her offspring the intelligent care which otherwise would be possible. By ties which bind her to false ideas of sex, a cruel and vain standard of sex ethics, she is doomed to nourish blindly and ignorantly the offspring she as blindly and ignorantly bears.

Mrs. Sarah Platt Decker, Denver.—Under equal suffrage, there is much more chivalrous devotion and respect on the part of men, who look upon their sisters not as playthings or as property, but as equals and fellow citizens.

Dr. M. Carey Thomas, president of Bryn Mawr College.—I confidently believe that equal suffrage is coming far more swiftly than most of us suspect. Educated, public-spirited women will soon refuse to be subjected to such humiliating conditions. Educated men will recoil in their turn from the sheer unreason of the position that the opinions and wishes of their wives and mothers are to be consulted upon every other question except the laws and government under which they and their husbands and children must live and die.

Mrs. Ellen M. Henrotin, Chicago.—Foreign women, it is argued, are not fit to have the ballot. The foreign women are usually better in morals and intelligence than the foreign men to whom the ballot is given.

Rt. Rev. Thomas Bowman, Methodist Episcopal bishop, New Jersey.—In quite early life I formed the opinion that women ought to vote, because it is right and for the best interests of the country. Years of observation and thought have strengthened this opinion.

Hon. Thomas W. Palmer, former United States Senator from Michigan.—If we are ever going to have a state of society whose progress shall be up and not down, I believe it must be through woman suffrage. Apart from the justice of the right conceded, the practical part must appeal to most men of unbiased minds.

Clara Barton.—I believe I must have been born believing in the full right of woman to all the privileges and positions which nature and justice accord to her in common with other human beings: Perfectly equal rights—human rights.

Lyon G. Tyler, president of William and Mary College.—I believe in sweeping away all limitations upon women and leaving to nature the determination of her proper position in society. No one denies that she is as much entitled as man to the fundamental rights—life, liberty, and property—and it is only logically just that she should have the means of protecting them. Prominent among these means are the right to vote and the right to hold office.

Mrs. K. A. Sheppard, president New Zealand Council of Women.—To-day a young New Zealander in his teens no longer regards his mother as belonging to a sex that must be kept within a prescribed sphere. That the lads and young men of a democracy should have their whole conception of the rights of humanity broadened is in itself an incalculable benefit.

Baroness Alexandra Gripenberg.—The suffrage law of Finland gives all women over 24 years of age the parliamentary vote and makes them eligible on exactly the same terms as men. Ever since the step was taken the men have behaved admirably. Our male coworkers aid us and advise us in the kindest and most fraternal way.

Mrs. Emily A. Fifield.—Women need the ballot, because in these days of clubs and associations they are learning more about their obligations to society, and the great burdens it has to bear. To-day the community needs the most faithful work of all women who may have any capacity whatever, and every strong woman wishes to do her full share of such work.

Dr. Earl Barnes, New Jersey.—To raise the political plane of America we must begin with the children and gradually raise the tone of the entire population. As the majority of teachers in intelligent communities are women, women should be given the right of suffrage so that they may learn just what to impart to the minds of children.

Selma Lagerlof, Sweden.—Women must enter all fields; they must be on hand everywhere, if the State is ever to be beloved like the home. We believe that the winds of God are bearing us onward, that our little masterwork, the home, was our creation with the help of man. The great masterwork, the State, shall be perfected by man when in all seriousness he takes woman as his helper.

Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis, Brooklyn.—Women have more time to read and study and are improving their time. Eventually they will vote and tell the men for whom they shall vote. Eventually all the universities will be coeducational and the women will carry off almost all the prizes.

William Marion Reedy, editor St. Louis Mirror.—"Votes for women" is a slogan that must win. It is the battle cry of a movement for the economic emancipation of the sex. All evils are curable only through freedom. A free womanhood is therefore necessary to cleanse our social and economic system.

Rabbi Charles Fleischer, Boston.—We are not a democracy so long as woman does not take her place in full equality before the law with man. Rights are not to be measured by the numbers who want them. So long as there is one woman who wants the right to vote, she is, according to the spirit of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, entitled to that right.

Mrs. Helen Gilbert Ecob.—The disreputable women in any part of the United States represent but an infinitesimal proportion of its population, and the vote of that class in Denver is confined practically to 3 precincts out of 120.

Rev. James Freeman Clarke.—I leave it to others to speak of suffrage as a right or a privilege; I speak of it as a duty. * * * What right have you women to leave all this work of caring for the country with men? Is it not your country as well as theirs? Are not your children to live in it after you are gone? And are you not bound to contribute whatever faculty God has given you to make it and keep it a pure, safe, and happy land?

Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, president International Woman Suffrage Alliance.—Some men say that they would protect women from the deterioration of voting. There is a class of women in this country who are already represented, women who are a power in government, and we who do not belong to that class ask, more than for any other reason, that we may have the right to protect and to defend and to represent at the polls the virtuous women of this country. To-day when you attack the saloon in any State of the Union you also attack the brothel; if you attack the brothel you attack the gambling den; and it is this great triple alliance that to-day stands more than any other against the enfranchisement of women.

Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton.—The ballot is a citizen's tongue and hands. Without a ballot and the dignity and power that scepter gives, the moral influence of the city mothers is essentially crippled in combating the evils of society. If educated, intelligent, and virtuous women had the right of suffrage

our best men would always find in them a reserve moral power to establish a safe and stable government.

Rt. Rev. Bernard J. McQuaid, late Roman Catholic bishop, Rochester, N. Y.—It fills me with joy when I think of the many changes that will be brought about when women have the right of suffrage. They will defy the politicians and vote as any Christian man should and would vote if he had the moral courage.

Thomas Wentworth Higginson.—Woman must be enfranchised. It is a mere question of time. She must be a slave or an equal; there is no middle ground. Admit in the slightest degree her right to property or education, and she must have the ballot to protect the one and use the other. And there are no objections to this, except such as would equally hold against the whole theory of republican government.

Ellen Glasgow.—True democracy means, if anything, neither class government nor sex government, but a government of all the people by all the people. Evolution has brought us to the recognition of the political equality of men. It is evolution; it is the law of progressive democracy that is leading us inevitably to the enfranchisement of women.

Harriet Prescott Spofford, Massachusetts.—I believe in woman suffrage because women are as integral a part of the Commonwealth as men and have equal social rights, and the first of all social rights is the right of self-government.

Rev. Charles Aked.—Nothing since the coming of Christ ever promised so much for the ultimate good of the human race as the intellectual, moral, and political emancipation of women.

Prof. W. I. Thomas, of Chicago University.—I think the case for woman suffrage may be regarded as virtually decided. We respond to reason slowly, but we are finally amenable to it. * * * The question is now in the condition where ways and means are beginning to be discussed rather than the general principle.

Dr. Margaret Long, Colorado.—Women count for more in all the affairs of this State than they do where they have not the power the suffrage gives. More attention is paid to their wishes and much greater weight given to their opinions and judgment.

Rev. George C. Lorimer.—All gatherings of women in clubs, assemblies, church guilds, charitable and philanthropic organizations, mothers' conventions, etc., are measures looking to the final triumph of woman suffrage. There is no reason why every discrimination which exists to-day against women should not be removed. Till then humanity will never attain the highest, and the ideals which we are cherishing will never be fulfilled.

Mrs. Helen L. Grenfell (for three terms State superintendent of public instruction for Colorado).—Instead of thinking less of their homes after they were granted the ballot, women began to consider them more carefully, and sought to bring into these close corporations something of the scientific spirit of the age. Chairs of domestic economy were established in the State agricultural college and the State normal school. Interest in the old-fashioned womanly arts has increased instead of diminishing.

Rev. Anna Howard Shaw, president National American Woman Suffrage Association.—Since 8,000,000 American women are employed in gainful occupation, every principle of justice known to a republic demands that the 8,000,000 toilers be enfranchised in order that they may be able to obtain and enforce legislation for their own protection.

William M. Salter.—Suffrage is not a mechanical thing by itself; it is the act of a citizen, and presupposes public aims. I do not plead for a mere mechanical right to put a piece of printed paper into a ballot box. I plead for this right in connection with all it implies; I plead for woman's right to become a full-grown being.

Lincoln Steffens.—The question as to woman's suffrage is a question of democracy. All Democrats believe in it; and whoever does not is simply not a Democrat.

Rt. Rev. Samuel K. Fallows, bishop Reformed Episcopal Church, Chicago.—A woman is just as well qualified to cast a vote for every municipal officer in Chicago as any man.

Florence Nightingale.—It seems to me almost self-evident, an axiom, that every householder and taxpayer ought to have a voice in the expenditure of the money we pay, including, as this does, interests the most vital to a human being.

Prof. Charles Zueblin, Boston.—Properly understood, suffrage does not mean the appointing of ward heelers; it means the park system, and public schools, and hospitals, and playgrounds, and public libraries. In matters of this kind we can make no distinction between men and women. To-day, to secure the best results in city government we must have the common service of men and women.

Luther Burbank, California.—There is not a greater disgrace existing in the world to-day than that our women should not be allowed to vote, while foreigners, who know nothing of our Government or our institutions and have no interest in them, should be allowed to vote. That such a condition should exist in a civilized country is astounding beyond belief.

Eliza Calvert Hall, Kentucky.—The franchise is not given to a man in order that he may express the political views of his wife, his sister, or his maiden aunt. It is conferred on him that he may express his own views; and, as this is a Republic, "a government of the people, by the people, for the people," and as women are people, the wife, the sister, and the maiden aunt should have the right to express their own views.

Mrs. A. Watson Lister, secretary of the Women's National Council of Australia.—One striking result of equal suffrage is that members of Parliament now consult us as to their bills when these bear upon the interests of women. The author of the new divorce bill asked all the women's organizations to come together and hear him read it and to make criticisms and suggestions. I do not remember any such thing happening before in all my years in Australia. When a naturalization bill was pending, one clause of which deprived Australian women of citizenship if they married aliens, a few women went privately to the prime minister and protested, and that clause was altered immediately. After we had worked for years with members of Parliament for various reforms without avail, because we had no votes, you can not imagine the difference it makes.

Edward T. Devine, general secretary New York Charity Organizations Society.—For as long as I can remember I have been an advocate of the suffrage for women. What appeals to me as a citizen, as a campaigner for social amelioration and for social justice, is the substantial value for the advancement of all the specific causes in which I am interested and for the solution of the problems about which I am most deeply concerned, of the active participation of women in the tasks of citizenship. Who can doubt that all these fundamental questions, these still unsolved problems of our common life, will yield their solution more certainly and more quickly when woman's experience, her insight and point of view, her traditions and resources, are brought to bear directly upon them?

Franklin H. Wentworth, Massachusetts.—The most compelling force in human society is now beginning to operate in conjunction with the brave spirits who so long have struggled to bring their sisters to the light; this force which even of itself will slowly overcome old habits of mind and breed a desire on the part of woman for the ballot. This is the power of economic determination—sheer necessity. Steadily, surely, relentlessly woman is being forced into the struggle for a livelihood with every stage of industrial evolution. In every walk of life she is colliding with the facts and forces that will bring her at last to see that the ballot is imperative if she is ever to enjoy common justice.

Prof. Henry E. Kelly.—Colorado has never heard of a case of family discord that was even alleged to have originated in woman suffrage.

Hon. Hugh H. Lusk, ex-member of New Zealand Parliament.—The family is the foundation of the State. We find that equal suffrage is the greatest family bond and tie; the greatest strengthener of family life.

Lady Holder, wife of Sir Frederick W. Holder, K. C. M. G., speaker of the House of Representatives of Federated Australia.—Women are more interested in public affairs than they used to be before they obtained the franchise, and politicians deal more earnestly with home and social questions, but no neglect of private duties on that account can be laid to the women's charge.

Hon. Carroll D. Wright.—The lack of direct political influence constitutes a powerful reason why women's wages have been kept at a minimum.

Hon. Ben. B. Lindsey, judge of the Denver Juvenile Court.—We have in Colorado the most advanced laws of any State in the Union for the care and protection of the home and the children, the very foundation of the Republic. We owe this more to woman suffrage than to any other cause.

Prof. Edward H. Griggs, New Jersey.—The ballot is an educator, and women will become more practical and more wise in using it.

Henry B. Blackwell.—A limited suffrage is always subject to corrupt influences, just in proportion to its limitation. Universal suffrage for all citizens, irrespective of sex, is the power that will save the people from political and industrial serfdom.

Mary Johnston, Virginia.—We have a thing called indirect influence, the indication of which is extreme indeed. It has been claimed that we are furnished with an ancient arquebuse called "virtual representation." Virtual representation. There is no such thing in the field of law, nor, I should imagine, in any other field. The elector is directly represented by the man he sends to the legislature. An army corps "virtually represented" on the battlefield sounds somehow like something out of "Alice in Wonderland." The arm the women want is the standard one of tested efficiency. It is called the ballot.

Lady Henry Somerset.—It is said that women ought not to vote because they do not fight. But she who bears soldiers does not need to bear arms.

Right Rev. J. W. Bashford, Methodist Episcopal Bishop in China.—If Christianity is completely to restore that which was lost in Adam, how can it stop short of completely abolishing the subordination of woman.

Lord Mayor Tallon of Dublin.—The women of Ireland, who vote in municipal elections, have suffered no loss either of dignity or domesticity.

Henry Ward Beecher.—We need the participation of woman in the ballot box. It is idle to fear that she will meet with disrespect or insult at the polls. Let her walk up firmly and modestly to deposit her vote, and if anyone ventures to molest her, the crowd will swallow him up as the whale swallowed up Jonah.

Rev. Walter Walsh, Dundee.—You can get at the best side of the electorate through the women being interested in the higher side of life, and voting for the things that promote it. In Scotland, where women have the municipal vote, every reformer knows that if he can get the women to understand his program he will be stronger at the polls.

Mrs. Mary Kenney O'Sullivan, vice president Women's National Trade Union League.—When women organize and vote, they will get equal pay for equal work.

Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, New York City.—A certain minister says women ought not to vote because suffrage is not a natural but a derived right. So is the right of children to a common-school education. So is our right to sanitary and police protection. It is not natural. Heaven did not make policemen. But who will say that girls should be shut out from school or women from police protection because it is not a natural right?

Mrs. Fanny B. Ames.—The factory girl needs the ballot for the same reason that she needs education or any other privilege that will lift her in the scale of human beings. There is a great body of law which applies exclusively to the working girl and regulates her relations with her employer. She must work under these laws, but she has had no voice in making them.

Louis D. Brandeis, Boston.—The change in my opinion with respect to woman suffrage is due to the result of my own experience in the various movements with which I have been connected in which we have tried to solve the social, economic, and political problems that have presented themselves from time to time. As years have passed I have been more and more impressed with the difficulty and complexity of those problems, and also with the power of society to solve them; but I am convinced that for their solution we must look to the many, not to the few. We need all the people, women as well as men.

Hon. Joseph M. Carey, governor of Wyoming.—It is only a question of time when the women of all the States in the Union will be voting. We have had woman suffrage on trial in Wyoming for 43 years, and it is an unqualified success. It undoubtedly adds greatly to woman's power and opportunity for good.

Hon. Oliver W. Stewart, Illinois.—The granting of the ballot to women is along the line of the higher development of our humanity. I hope the time may never come when I can be so forgetful of the interests, rights, or liberties of any human being as to refuse such a simple act of justice, however few the number asking for it.

Louisa M. Alcott.—Every year gives me greater faith in it, greater hope of its success, and a more earnest wish to use what influence I possess for its advancement.

Baroness Aletta Korff, Finland.—In Finland over 50 per cent of the laws introduced into the three successive Diets have concerned the welfare of children. Many have been for rendering medical aid to poor women throughout

the country districts and for instructing them in the proper care of infants; many have treated of the improvement and extension of the public-school system and the care of school children; still others have dealt with special classes of children, orphans, waifs, and juvenile delinquents. The schools of domestic training are of great importance, especially in the country districts and among the poorer class of people. They are becoming most valuable factors in the cultural development of the country, and are doing more than perhaps could be done in any other way to raise the general standard of living.

Reginald Wright Kauffman.—I do not believe that the extension of the suffrage to women is right; I know that it is right. I know it through the familiar arguments advanced by its advocates, and I know it through my own experience with the victims of a world conducted in the interests of the capitalistic male human being. When it is argued that general woman's suffrage would give power to "immoral" women, I reply that no woman has a better right to the ballot than the street woman, because no other woman is quite so directly the victim of those governmental and industrial conditions that can be cured only by either violence or the ballot.

Hon. Walter R. Stubbs, governor of Kansas.—I am and always have been in favor of equal suffrage. The question will be submitted to the voters of this State at the fall election of 1912, and will undoubtedly result in the full enfranchisement of the women of Kansas.

Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, Cornell University.—The present world movement for the enfranchisement of women shows that, under the influence of advancing civilization, the nations of the earth are becoming ready for universal suffrage and the conception of society which it implies. For, in the ultimate analysis, it is not the extension of political rights to the last disfranchised class, important as this is, that is so deeply significant in this movement, nor even the fact that this class consists of women, but the new sense of social possibilities which it betokens.

Rev. David Gregg.—Everybody feels the justice of the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." Would men have women rob them of their ballot? No. Then let not men rob women of their ballot. That is the Golden Rule put into practical form.

Rev. Francis E. Clark, president United Society of Christian Endeavor.—I do not know of any unanswerable argument against woman suffrage, and I know a great many arguments in its favor. As I have seen its operation in New Zealand and other parts of the world, my belief in it has been strengthened.

George W. Cable.—I have never seen an argument against woman suffrage that was not flimsy. Men are much disposed to exaggerate the difficulties of voting intelligently when they talk of women voting. By the time a public question is ready for the popular vote it has become a very simple question that requires little more than honesty and common sense to vote upon it. If our mothers are not fit to vote, they ought to stop bearing sons.

Mary E. Woolley, president of Mount Holyoke College.—In temperance work, on school and health boards, in prison reform, in peace conferences, in factory and shop inspection, in civil service reform, in attempts to solve social and industrial problems, women are not only a factor, but in many cases the chief workers. It seems almost inexplicable that changes surely as radical as giving women the vote should be accepted as perfectly natural, while the political right is still viewed somewhat askance. The time will come when one shall look back upon the arguments against granting the suffrage to women with as much incredulity as we now read the arguments against their education.

John H. Mickey, ex-governor of Nebraska.—In the Nebraska Legislature 24 years ago I voted "aye" on the submission of a suffrage amendment to the voters of Nebraska. I have never had occasion since to change my views.

W. E. Mullen, attorney general of Wyoming.—Woman suffrage stimulates interest and study on the part of women in public affairs. Questions of public interest are discussed in the home; more papers and magazines are read, and the interests of the State and the home are promoted.

Peter Finley Dunne, Chicago ("Mr. Dooley").—If Molly Donahue wint to vote in a livery stable, th' first thing she'd do wud be to get a broom, sweep up th' floors, take th' harness from th' walls, an' hang up a picture iv Niagary be moonlight; chase out th' watchers an' polis, remove th' seegars, make th' Judges get a shave, an p'raps invalydate th' illiction. It's no job fr her, an' I told her so.

Mrs. Julia Ward Howe.—The weapon of Christian warfare is the ballot, which represents the peaceable assertion of conviction and will. Society everywhere

is becoming converted to its use. Adopt it, O you women, with clean hands and a pure heart! * * * If manhood suffrage is unsatisfactory, it does not at all show that woman suffrage would be. On the contrary, we might make it much better by bringing to it the feminine mind, which, in a way, complements the masculine, and so completes the mind of humanity.

George Meredith.—I am strongly in favor of woman suffrage. Until you throw open to women every avenue of employment in which they can use their faculties, you will never realize the service they can render. I would give them all a vote and give it to them at once.

Emil G. Hirsch.—Every right goes with a duty. Women pay taxes and do public service and hold up before us the standard of righteousness, and they ought to have a vote.

Hon. John Burke, governor of North Dakota.—In my opinion, the woman-suffrage movement is growing, and it is only a question of time until there will be adopted in all the States legislation granting women the right of suffrage.

Mrs. Elsie Clews Parsons.—I believe the ballot would be a good thing for American women, especially those of the leisure class. If it did nothing else, it would give them legitimate interests, which they lack now.

Hon. Henry Waldo Coe, former United States Senator from Oregon.—I have a mother to whom I owe everything, and I should not think of denying her the right to vote. The woman who takes an interest in the affairs of the country takes the best interest in the home.

Rev. Charles F. Thwing, president Western Reserve University and Adelbert College.—The woman-suffrage movement seems to me to be right, not so much for what it is in itself as for what it effects; it is in the line of the general elevation of the race; it represents a higher civilization; it increases the power of those things that make for righteousness.

George C. Pardee, ex-governor of California.—I see no reason why women—simply because they are women—should not have the privilege of the suffrage.

Hon. Hiram Johnson, governor of California.—I stand for votes for women.

Hon. Robert M. La Follette, United States Senator from Wisconsin.—I have always believed in woman suffrage to the same extent as man suffrage for the reason that the interests of men and women are not superior nor antagonistic one to the other, but are mutual and inseparable. Cosuffrage, like coeducation, will react, not to the special advantage of either men or women, but will result in a more enlightened, better balanced citizenship and truer democracy.

Rev. Charles G. Ames.—Political enfranchisement would go far to quicken women's sense of social and public responsibility, and would put into their hands a mighty instrument for making their interest in reform effective.

Lucy Stone.—Some woman risks her life whenever a soldier is born into the world. For years she does picket duty by his cradle. Later on she is his quartermaster and gathers his rations. And when that boy grows to a man, shall he say to his mother, "If you want to vote, you must first go and kill somebody"? It is a coward's argument.

Hon. Oswald West, governor of Oregon.—I am in favor of the woman-suffrage movement. I think there is justice in the demand of its advocates, and in my opinion it will in time be successful in this State. I would not attempt to prophesy whether woman suffrage will be national in its scope within 10 years, but I do believe that within that time many more States will have adopted it than at present.

Mrs. Russell Sage.—By the year 1914 the suffrage movement will have advanced to the point where the necessary amendment to the Constitution, urged by a monster petition of women who own property, will be passed by the legislative bodies of New York State, and when once the women of the Empire State go to the polls the women of all the States of the Union will be given the same right.

Prof. Frederick D. Maurice.—By withholding suffrage from women we make them, it seems to me, politicians of the worst sort. On the other hand, if the legislature frankly admitted women to the exercise of the suffrage, it would, I believe, gradually raise the tone of the whole land by raising the tone of those who, often to their injury, govern its governments.

Hon. Thomas B. Reed.—No one who listens to the reasons given by the superior class for the continuance of any system of subjection can fail to be impressed with the noble disinterestedness of mankind. Hence, when it is proposed to give the women an opportunity to present their case to the various State legislatures to demand equality of political rights, it is not surprising to find that the reasons on which the continuance of the inferiority of women is

urged are drawn almost entirely from a tender consideration of their own good. The anxiety felt lest they should thereby deteriorate would be an honor to human nature were it not an historical fact that the same sweet solicitude has been put up as a barrier against every progress which women have made since civilization began.

Hon. Frederick C. Howe.—I believe in woman suffrage, not for women alone, not for men alone, but for the advantage of both men and women.

Hon. William Dudley Foulke, Indiana.—A just man ought to accord to every other human being, even to his own wife, the rights which he demands for himself. It makes no difference whether all women want to vote or whether most want to vote. So long as there is one woman who insists upon this simple right the justice of man can not afford to deny it.

Rev. Charles F. Dole, Massachusetts.—Politics is properly the friendly consideration of all manner of common interests, in which the women are as much concerned as the men are. Why should the State, then, keep up the Old World barrier of political inferiority against mothers, sisters, and wives? No one can give any reason, except such arguments of conservative timidity as have generally withstood every step in the advancement of mankind.

Mary A. Livermore.—We used to ask for suffrage because women needed it as a means to larger opportunities. But the aspect of the woman question has changed. Women are now saying, as in the days of the war, "The country needs us."

Louis F. Post, editor of The Public.—To say that women are too frail to be burdened with the vote is sheer nonsense, unless it means much more than the burden of going to the polls and dropping a ballot into a box. * * * Unless it means that the voting right would impose a duty to take a vital interest in public affairs, the argument falls flat. But if this is the gist of the argument, then it is a plea for the exemption of women from taking any vital interest in public affairs, and the woman who in fact takes no interest in public affairs is unfit for mothering citizens in a democratic Republic.

Prof. Lucy M. Salmon, Vassar College.—College women are learning that the enemy of society is not the woman in Colorado who votes, but the woman in New York who plays bridge. It is not the woman who takes an intelligent interest in the life of which she is a part, but the woman who sits by the window and watches the callers of her neighbors across the way. Not the woman who works in the shops or the factory, but the woman whose days are passed at the bargain counter. Not the woman who earns money, but the woman who wastes it, because she has never learned its value.

W. A. Johnston, chief justice Supreme Court of Kansas.—In consequence (of woman suffrage) our elections are more orderly and fair, a higher class of officers are chosen, and we have cleaner and stronger city governments.

Mrs. Florence Kelley, secretary National Consumers' League.—Does anyone believe that if the women had power to make themselves felt in the administration of affairs we should have 80,000 children on half time in the schools in New York City? Does anyone believe we should have to boil our water before we dare to drink it? It would make a vast difference in American cities if women could enforce their will and conscience by the ballot.

Amelie Rives Troubetzkoy.—I have believed in the political freedom of women ever since I read John Stuart Mill on the subject over 20 years ago.

Amos R. Wells, editor of the Christian Endeavor World.—Desiring to learn how the women were using their privilege in the four enfranchised States, I wrote to a number of the clergymen in those States, taking their names at random from the subscription lists of our paper. I received 25 replies. Four leading denominations were represented, and a goodly proportion of the writers were doctors of divinity. The answers were almost unanimously favorable to woman suffrage. I had asked whether the experiment was working well, fairly well, or poorly. One gentleman in Wyoming thought it was working poorly, three in Colorado thought it was working fairly well, and all the rest were positive, and some of them enthusiastic, in their statements that it was working well.

Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman.—Politics govern even the purity of the milk supply. It is not "outside the home," but inside the baby.

E. W. Hoch, ex-governor of Kansas.—By the way, who gave man the right to decide this matter, anyhow? Why haven't women as much right to disfranchise men as men have to disfranchise women? Isn't it, as a matter of fact, a brutal usurpation of power, a relic of primitive barbarity, when might made right, unworthy of a chivalrous, modern manhood? I believe the time is hastening when the manhood and womanhood of our land will be mutually blended

in civil government as they are now beautifully blended in the highest and best type of civil government—the ideal home.

Mrs. Lydia Kingswell Commander, New York.—I consider the ballot the best cure for race suicide.

Samuel Milton Jones, late "Golden-Rule" mayor of Toledo.—When the question is fairly put to them I find no men who deny this proposition of the equality of the sexes. Who but a blasphemer could say that his mother is inferior to himself? No one would expect to develop an ideal family life where the mother was regarded as inferior to the father, where the children were taught to look upon the mother as an inferior being. Spiritual equality must be admitted before there can be perfect cooperation. As the perfect family can not be produced except by the equal cooperation of the father and mother, so no scheme of government will ever be a just government that does not build upon this principle as its foundation stone.

Prof. R. E. Macnaghten, McGill University, Montreal, formerly of Tasmania.—Ninety per cent of the men of Australia would agree that the concession of the vote to women has been a real benefit to the state. They have very largely declared themselves against privilege, against monopolies of all kinds, against the raising of the cost of living, in favor of individual liberty, in favor of temperance, moral and physical cleanliness, and all that goes to build up a good national character.

Theodore Parker.—I believe in the admission of woman to the full rights of citizenship and share in the government, on the express grounds that few women keep house so badly or with such wastefulness as chancellors of the exchequer keep the state, and womanly genius for organization applied to affairs of the nation would be extremely economical and beneficial.

Israel Zangwill.—There is no problem upon which an intelligent woman can not throw some new light. In neglecting woman's help men are blundering, not merely in what they do, but still more badly in what they do not do, in the terribly important provinces of life which they leave untouched by legislation. We men require women's suffrage as much for our own sakes as for women's sakes.

Mrs. Maud Ballington Booth.—I believe emphatically that a woman's place is home; but where is her home? Mine is all the way from Boston to San Francisco and from Canada to the Gulf. The question is not what a woman should be allowed to do, but can she do it properly? In this reform (woman suffrage) home is the very watchword, for all the interests of the home and all the evils that affect the home are largely dependent upon politics. Women not only should have the power to deal with these, but they could wield it effectively.

Winston Churchill.—I shall try my best to get women the franchise. The women have always had a logical case, and they have now got behind them a great popular demand among women.

W. B. Borah, United States Senator from Idaho.—The vote as a political potentiality is a powerful factor at all times in shaping the policies of State campaigns and in determining in some measure, although not to the same extent, the qualities of candidates. And this factor is always for the good, for whether women may make mistakes or not in the matter of actual voting, men universally accredit to them the aptitude of getting upon the right side of those great moral and quasi-moral questions which are entering more and more into State campaigns.

Rev. Edward McSweeney, Mount St. Marys, Md.—I hope that women will consent to vote, as they do in England, for public officers. For the life of me I never could see that Blanche of Castile, or Matilda of Canossa, or Victoria Guelph were less exemplary as women for their being all their lives mixed in politics; and I think that a great onward step in the progress of mankind will be made when every adult person shall take an active part in the government of our country. Should she decide to take part in politics she will help to purify these, and then the vast number of men of intelligence and refinement who now avoid the polls will take a practical interest in good government.

Rev. Caroline Bartlett Crane, of Michigan.—Women have considered it a prime virtue to wholly subordinate themselves and their point of view to man; both because they have been and are economically dependent on men, and because they love them—most of all, because they love them and wish to fulfill the ideals of men for women. But never shall we have the truly womanly woman until she is made free to think her thoughts and look at the world through her own eyes, and add her verdict to that of man upon the things of

life which affect her and her children, often far more poignantly than they affect him.

Rev. William C. Gannett, Rochester, N. Y.—Womanhood and motherhood will yet be arguments for voting, as manhood and fatherhood are to-day; and the scorn will be for those whose "refinement" shirks the duty, and for the mannishness which would bar out a woman, as a woman, from the right.

Hon. Francis E. Warren, United States Senator from Wyoming.—Our women nearly all vote, and since in Wyoming, as elsewhere, the majority of women are good and not bad, the results are good and not evil.

Frances Moule Bjorkman.—I am a suffragist, not primarily because I believe that the woman's vote will purify the ballot, and not because I have a sense of humiliation in being classed with infants and idiots, but because in the course of seven years' active newspaper reporting in Denver, Chicago, and New York it has been positively demonstrated to me that a vote is a thing worth having.

Mrs. Ednah D. Cheney.—We hear little to-day of the "angel" argument, that women are too fine for the coarse, rough work of the world, and should be shielded in hothouses, where not even the wind of heaven should visit them too roughly. Whoever has worked side by side with women in sanitary commissions and prison boards, has seen them go fearlessly into police courts to secure the protection of families, or into foul wards of hospitals to save human lives, knows that this is not the type of American woman, however it may be the lady of romance. Your women on the boards of charities, in benevolent institutions, in churches, in their daily round of work, may spend health and strength and life in mitigating the effects of evil; but when the question is on removing causes they have no vote.

David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University.—Equal suffrage would tend to broaden the minds of women and to increase their sense of personal responsibility. It may help to solve the problem of honest and clean local government and make our cities centers of sweetness and light, as well as of activity and strength.

Dr. Charles A. Beard, Columbia University.—Woman suffrage will come as a result of the increasing economic independence of women, which will in turn sharpen her intellect, force upon her an interest in the social and economic conditions which are determining her own destiny in so great a measure, and finally give her that self-respect and self-sufficiency which prevent her from being content with the alternate adoration and contempt of the opposite sex.

Hon. Bryant B. Brooks, ex-governor of Wyoming.—I consider woman suffrage of great benefit to any Commonwealth. There is certainly no argument which can be made against it.

Rev. George Hodges, dean of Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.—I am in favor of bringing the votes of women to the reinforcement of all good causes.

Mrs. Clarence H. Mackay, New York City.—I want women to vote because it will improve the educational system of the whole country.

Hon. C. S. Thomas, ex-governor of Colorado.—To the breadwinning portion of the sex (female) the ballot is a boon. She is a factor whose power must be respected. Like her brother, she must be reckoned with at the polls. Hence it is her buckler against industrial wrong, her protection against the constant tendency to reduce her wages because of helplessness. If no other reason existed for conferring this right upon womankind, this, to the man of justice, should be all sufficient.

Edwin Markham.—The woman movement of this country is its most significant movement, because it brings human hearts together. We want not the rule of gold, but the Golden Rule. To carry this out in this world we need the help of the women. I am a very ardent woman suffragist.

Dorothy Dix.—Women should vote, because every question of politics affects the woman in the home. Out of the woman's housekeeping allowance, which has not increased, come the increased profits of the Beef Trust, and the Milk Trust, and the Sugar Trust, and the Canned Goods Trust. If women had a say-so in making the laws, they would have long ago clipped the wings of the predatory combinations that have increased the cost of living so greatly.

George F. Hoar.—We have driven our leading opponent from one position to another, until there is not a thoughtful opponent of woman suffrage to be found who is not obliged to deny the doctrine which is affirmed in our Declaration of Independence.

Mrs. Zerelda G. Wallace.—More and more the schools of America are passing under the control of woman, and she has so demonstrated her fitness to teach

that this educational reform will not go backward. Then, for the safety of the Nation, it must go forward till, by her enfranchisement, her fitness to be the teacher of America's future citizens will be complete.

Hon. L. F. C. Garvin, ex-governor of Rhode Island.—Whoever accepts the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence must believe in the right of women to vote. If taxation without representation is tyranny, if government derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, then the suffrage must be extended to women upon the same terms as to men.

Rev. J. W. Hamilton, Methodist Episcopal bishop, Boston.—I believe the work for equal suffrage to be a Christian work, and I try to aid it because I am a Christian minister. I always enjoy reminding people that the first woman's rights convention in this country was held in a Methodist church.

Hon. Joseph Walker, Massachusetts.—Some people believe in limiting the suffrage; I believe in broadening it. I believe that the welfare of the country is far safer in the hands of the ordinary men and women who are up against the hard, cruel facts of life than in the hands of the few of greater wealth and education, perhaps, and supposed to be higher up in the social scale, but who, experience has shown us, are frequently more intent on exploiting than on serving the people.

Hon. John F. Shafroth, ex-governor of Colorado.—Woman suffrage is not only right, but practical. It tends to elevate. There is not a caucus but is better attended, and by better people, and held in a better place. I have seen the time when a political convention without a disturbance and the drawing of weapons was rare. That time is past in Colorado, and it is due to the presence of women. Every man now shows that civility which makes him take off his hat and not swear, and deport himself decently when ladies are present.

Prof. Sophonisba Breckenridge, University of Chicago.—Under our present form of city life, housekeeping has become a public function, and the ballot has become a domestic necessity. The housekeeper must buy milk and meat; she must make the clothing, or buy it ready-made. She needs a vote on the ordinances which control the conditions. She must have something to say about the men who make and enforce them. She has not the power she needs as a housekeeper unless she feels that the officials of the city are as much responsible to her as are the domestic servants she elects.

His Eminence Patrick Francis Moran, late Cardinal of Australia.—The woman who votes only avails herself of a rightful privilege that democracy has gained for her. No longer a mere household chattel, she is recognized as man's fellow worker and helpmate, and credited with public spirit and intelligence. As a mother, she has a special interest in the legislation of her country, for upon it depends the welfare of her children. She knows what is good for them just as much as the father, and the unselfishness of maternity should make her interest even keener. She should deem it one of the grandest privileges of her sex that she can now help to choose the men who will make the laws under which her children must live, and exert her pure influence upon the political atmosphere of her time.

M. J. Savage.—I have not found a respectable reason why women should not vote, although I have read almost everything that has been written on the subject on both sides.

George William Curtis.—As a stockholder, a woman may vote upon a railroad from one end of the country to the other. But if she sells her stock and buys a house with the money, she has no voice in the laying out of the road before her door, which her house is taxed to keep and pay for. Why, in the name of good sense, if a responsible human being may vote upon specific industrial projects, may she not vote upon the industrial regulation of the State?

Hon. H. V. S. Groesbeck, late judge of the United States Supreme Court of Wyoming.—The influence of the women voters has always been on the side of temperance, morality, and good government, and opposed to drunkenness, gambling, and immorality.

Dr. H. Heber Newton.—I am glad to express my emphatic conviction, not merely that woman is entitled to franchise, but that the logical issue of American citizenship, as of Christian justice and morality, is certain to put the ballot in the hands of woman.

Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, Boston.—Not only must millions of women now earn their living outside the home, but the housekeeper, as well as they, is more and more dependent upon outside conditions which only a voter can efficiently control and which every woman who loves her home ought to desire to help control.

Rt. Rev. John Lancaster Spalding, Roman Catholic archbishop, Peoria, Ill.—The experiment (of equal suffrage) will be made, whatever our theories and prejudices may be. Women are the most religious, the most moral, and the most sober portion of the American people, and it is not easy to understand why their influence in public life is dreaded.

Flora Anna Steele.—Women's natural task of child bearing places them in the first fighting line. The essence of military service is the risking of life and the endurance of hardship for the general good. Surely if the long, irksome months ending in pain and danger which go to the making of every citizen were summed up, the grand total of devotion would be with the woman and not with the man, even in war time.

Prof. Frances Squire Potter.—Our cause is universal; its majesty is intrinsic; its logic is unanswerable; its success is sure.

Hon. Clarence D. Clark, United States Senator from Wyoming.—Woman suffrage worked with wonderfully good results while the territorial form of government lasted, and when Wyoming became a State was put into the constitution. So far as I am informed, nobody who has the interest of the State at heart has ever desired or suggested a change.

Sir Robert Stout, chief justice of New Zealand.—Woman suffrage has been beneficial. It has interested women in questions of state and it is difficult to estimate its educative influence.

Lady Stout, wife of the chief justice of New Zealand.—The most marked and beneficial effect of the franchise in New Zealand is that the women are awakening to the responsibilities of motherhood, and consider their living children of more value to the State than those that are peopling the graveyard.

Hon. George Foulds, minister of education and public health, New Zealand.—The extension of the suffrage to the women of New Zealand has made for the moral welfare of the whole community. Without being revolutionary, their influence has been on the side of progress and clean government. * * * I should say the almost universal verdict of the people of New Zealand would be that the admission of women to the franchise was not only right in principle, but satisfactory in practice.

Hon. John George Findlay, M. L. C., attorney general and colonial secretary, New Zealand.—The women's franchise in New Zealand has, on the whole, resulted in good to the well-being and progress of the Colony. As regards the use made by women of the vote, you have the statistics of the last elections in New Zealand, and particularly the last federal election (Australia), in which it will be found women exercised their vote as freely as the men. I consider that the educational work done by the organized women of the Colony since 1890 has been a great factor in stimulating humanitarian interest.

Hon. Robert S. Vessey, governor of South Dakota.—In my opinion, the suffrage movement is one that will ultimately win. In the first place, I have been unable to find any good reason why men should have the right of suffrage that does not equally apply to women. I have no fear that woman will be made less womanly because of the extension to her of this right, and I do believe that it will materially improve the quality of conscience expressed at the ballot box of the country, and also give to women a just and proper consideration in matters pertaining to legislation. In other words, the success of the movement will accomplish much for our Government by more adequately equalizing justice in the interests of the entire citizenship.

Susan B. Anthony.—There is and can be but one safe principle of government—equal rights to all. Discrimination against any class on account of color, nativity, sex, property, culture, can but embitter and disaffect that class, and thereby endanger the safety of the whole people.

Rev. Joseph M. Gleason.—The Catholic Church teaches above all things reverence for women and veneration for motherhood; but there is no danger to the dignity of womanhood or motherhood to be feared from the ballot. The fact that a woman is the mother of sons and daughters will tend to make her more careful in voting for the government under which her children are to be reared. I am looking at the question as a priest of the Catholic Church. We need the women to hold back the forces of corruption and give decency and fair-mindedness a chance. She should be man's equal not alone in the home but in the body politic, and she will. You might as well try to stop the torrents of Niagara as to stop equal suffrage.

Hon. James H. Hawley, governor of Idaho.—I have stood for woman suffrage for 41 years. Woman exercises the franchise quite as intelligently as man and with a higher degree of conscientiousness. All our best women vote, and by so doing exert a powerful influence for good in the administration of public affairs.

Hon. Francis E. Warren, United States Senator from Wyoming.—Our women are intelligently active in public affairs, but, withal, as womanly and as devoted to home and family as their sisters in States where women do not vote. Woman suffrage has elevated public morals and been a material factor in maintaining the local good government we enjoy.

SUFFRAGE AND TEMPERANCE.

[By Alice Stone Blackwell, editor of the *Woman's Journal*.]

Ill-informed antisuffragists often claim that equal suffrage has nowhere lessened the number of saloons.

The Pacific, a journal representing the Congregational Churches of the Pacific coast, said in its issue of December 4, 1912: "Two years ago we had but 200 dry towns in all California. To-day we have about 675." The editor of the Home Alliance, a temperance paper published at Woodland, Cal., gives the exact number of California's dry towns at present as 682.

The State president of the Wyoming Woman's Christian Temperance Union writes the *Woman's Journal* that before the granting of equal suffrage all Wyoming was wet, and that now 90 per cent of the State is dry territory.

The State president of the Utah Woman's Christian Temperance Union writes us that when the Utah Legislature, in 1911, passed a State-wide local-option law, 110 cities went dry and only 18 went wet—and out of these 18 so-called cities 16 were mining camps. Every county in Utah but one is now dry.

In Colorado, within four years after the granting of equal suffrage, the number of no-license towns had more than quadrupled, and it has increased still more largely since. When State-wide prohibition was lately defeated in Colorado, Ellis Meredith, the head of Denver's reform election commission, and a strong advocate of the "dry" policy, wrote in the *Woman's Journal* for November 16, 1912, concerning the result of the election: "It is because under our local option law conditions are so good and dry territory increasing so fast that many people feel we shall come nearer regulating the traffic in this way than by so-called total prohibition, with the police power in all the big towns opposed to it." The organ of the brewers in Denver says Colorado made a great mistake in giving votes to women. So far as we know, it is the only paper in the State which takes this ground.

The State president of the West Washington Woman's Christian Temperance Union writes us that in her State the "wets" have gained two towns and the "drys" have gained 115. When one or two towns in an enfranchised State go wet, opponents of suffrage in other States make a great outcry about it and avoid mentioning the hundred or more towns that went dry.

The experience of all enfranchised States is similar, and it is so even at the antipodes. Lady Stout, wife of the chief justice of New Zealand, contributed to the *Englishwoman* of May and June, 1910, two noteworthy articles on "What the franchise has done for the women and children of New Zealand." She enumerated many benefits, including the improved care for child life which has made New Zealand's death rate the lowest in the world. Among other things, she mentioned the great increases in dry territory, and added: "I think I can safely say that these results could never have been achieved without the women's vote."

Equal suffrage has nowhere led to State-wide prohibition, but it has everywhere led to a large extension of no-license territory. Rev. Dr. B. F. Crary, who was for years presiding elder of the Methodist Episcopal Churches in northern Colorado and Wyoming, says of woman suffrage: "Liquor sellers and gamblers are unanimous in cursing it."

An effort is being made by opponents of equal rights, in Michigan and elsewhere, to show that it is the suffragists and not the antis who are in alliance with the liquor traffic. The audacity of this is enough to make a mummy smile. Suffragists as well as antis are divided in opinion as to whether license or no license is the wiser policy; but the liquor interest is practically unanimous in its conviction that votes for women would be bad for its business. Moreover, it is willing to back up that conviction with unlimited cash.

Asked why the liquor interest opposes equal suffrage, Mrs. A. J. George (herself an advocate of license) answers, "It does not." This is so contrary to universal knowledge that it is hardly worth denying.

The official organ of the Retail Liquor Dealers' Association in Wisconsin bears the inappropriate name of "Progress." It fought equal suffrage bitterly all through the campaign of 1912, and afterwards boasted editorially of having helped to defeat it. Mrs. Maud Wood Park, who took part in the Ohio campaign of 1912, says she never saw anything like the ferocity of the fight the liquor dealers put up against it. She brought home samples of the antisuffrage cartoons that were hung up in the barrooms, and no doubt she would be willing to show them to anyone who calls to see them at the office of the Boston E. S. A., 585 Boylston Street.

Antisuffragists are also expressing great horror because some suffrage speakers have reminded their audiences that women as well as men are divided on the license question, and that none of the suffrage States have State-wide prohibition. This professed horror is pure hypocrisy. The antis are always glad of all the votes the liquor interest can bring them, and do not hesitate to appeal to proliquor sentiment. Some years ago the Massachusetts Woman's Christian Temperance Union petitioned for a bill to give women a vote on the license question. The "Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women" opposed it. At the hearing their attorney (Mr. Thomas Russell) said: "If this bill passes, prohibition will be carried in every town and city of the Commonwealth, contrary to the will of the people." On this occasion members of the legislature's committee on election laws asked several officers of the M. A. O. F. E. S. W., including its president, whether they would vote for license or no license if they had the ballot. Every one of them answered that she would vote for license. Mrs. Francis Goddard, of Colorado Springs, whom the antis are always quoting against suffrage in Colorado, fought with might and main to have her home town go wet. Very good people are to be found on both sides of the license question, but it is unworthy to be a hypocrite, to criticise others for opinions that we ourselves hold, or to deny a fact known to all persons who are even ordinarily well informed—that the liquor interest in general is in warm sympathy with the antisuffragists.

At another legislative hearing in Massachusetts, after several antis had argued that woman suffrage would not promote temperance, the attorney of the Wine and Spirits Association unexpectedly arose and announced that he was there in behalf of his association to oppose the bill. The antisuffrage ladies looked rather blank.

The Rev. Clarence True Wilson, of Oregon, is being quoted as saying that any State which adopts equal suffrage sets back temperance 25 years. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union held its annual meeting in Portland, Oreg., in October, 1912. One whole day was devoted to woman's ballot. The president of the State Woman's Christian Temperance Unions from all the suffrage States testified that woman's franchise has helped temperance, and the presidents of all the States where suffrage amendments had lately been defeated testified that the liquor interests had fought the amendments; and the convention passed a unanimous resolution condemning the Rev. Clarence True Wilson and denying his assertions.

[Since Oregon adopted woman suffrage, Mr. Wilson has acknowledged in the Union-Signal that experience has refuted all his predictions.]

THE WAGE-EARNING WOMAN AND THE STATE.

[A reply to Miss Minnie Bronson, by Edith Abbott, Ph. D., of Hull House, Chicago, and Sophonisba P. Breckinridge, LL. B., Ph. D., assistant professor of social economy in the University of Chicago, directors of the department of social investigation in the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy.]

PREFACE.

This reply to Miss Bronson's pamphlet has been written by Miss S. P. Breckinridge and Miss Edith Abbott, who are both well qualified, not only by rather unusual academic training, but also by practical experience, to speak authoritatively on questions relating to wage-earning women.

Miss Breckinridge is a graduate of Wellesley College, and later received the degree of doctor of philosophy in political science from the University of Chicago. Since 1902 she has been a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago, where she has given courses attended by both men and women on "The legal status of labor" and "The legal position of women." In 1904 she

was made a doctor of law, and she was also the first woman to be admitted to the bar of Kentucky, although she has never actively practiced. Since 1907 she has been, in addition, head of the department of social investigation at the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, which disburses a budget of \$10,000 from a grant of the Russell Sage Foundation, and which has published a series of valuable studies on social conditions in Chicago. Miss Breckinridge is also identified with many social interests in Chicago. She is president of the Woman's City Club, secretary of the Immigrants' Protective League, a member of the board of directors of the Legal Aid Society, of the Consumers' League, and of other similar organizations.

Miss Edith Abbott was graduated from the University of Nebraska, and later received the degree of doctor of philosophy in economics and law from the University of Chicago. She was for two years a fellow of the university, and studied in Europe for one year at the University of London in the school of economics. After teaching political economy at Wellesley College for one year, she entered the school of civics and philanthropy, where she has been associate director for the last five years. She is the author of a very authoritative work entitled "Women in Industry; a Study in American Economic History." Her knowledge of the conditions surrounding working women is by no means confined to America. She is in constant correspondence with the people most interested in the conditions of working women in England and the continental countries, and by travel and correspondence has kept herself well informed concerning the legal and industrial changes which affect the lives of women the world over. Both Miss Breckinridge and Miss Abbott are personally acquainted with hundreds of working women. Miss Abbott has been a resident of Hull House for the last few years, and Miss Breckinridge is in residence each year during her three months' vacation from teaching at the university. They thus add to their scholarly qualifications a keen and living interest in thousands of working women. (Jane Addams, Hull House, Chicago.)

"The statement is sometimes made that the franchise for women would be valuable only so far as the educated woman exercised it. This statement totally disregards the fact that those matters in which women's judgment is most needed are far too primitive and basic to be largely influenced by what we call education. The sanitary condition of all the factories and workshops, for instance, in which the industrial processes are at present carried on in great cities, intimately affects the health and lives of thousands of working women." (Jane Addams.)

THE WAGE-EARNING WOMAN AND THE STATE—A REPLY TO MISS MINNIE BRONSON.

A pamphlet entitled "The Wage-Earning Woman and the State" has been widely circulated by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It is written to prove that woman suffrage will not lead to fairer treatment of women in industry or to better laws for their protection. In support of this thesis the author of the pamphlet, Miss Minnie Bronson, stands practically alone opposed to the women who, as a result of long years of experience, are qualified to speak as to the conditions under which women work, the difficulties that have been surmounted in securing for them such protective legislation as has been gained, and the need of further efforts in their behalf.

Miss Jane Addams, of Hull House; Mrs Florence Kelley, secretary of the National Consumers' League; Mrs Raymond Robbins, president of the National Women's Trade Union League; Miss Helen Marot, secretary of the New York Women's Trade Union League; Miss Josephine Goldmark; and many others who speak with authority on subjects connected with women's work are earnest believers in woman suffrage as the surest method of bringing about such reforms as are needed for the protection of working women.

This pamphlet contains a list of the positions held at various times by Miss Bronson before she became a paid representative of the antisuffragists. It appears that Miss Bronson was a high-school teacher of mathematics from 1889 to 1899, and it is interesting to note that, out of nine different positions which she held during the years between 1899 and 1910, only two, both of which were temporary appointments with the United States Bureau of Labor, the first lasting about two years and the second for six months, indicate any qualification for attempting to speak authoritatively upon questions affecting the lives and interests of working women.

Inasmuch, then, as Miss Bronson is not herself an authority upon questions relating to women in industry, and is so radically opposed to the great body of testimony on the subject, it is important to examine her statements carefully. Her opening paragraph shows that she does not understand the woman-suffrage argument and it may be that, even for reasonably intelligent members of the community, that argument must be presented in simpler terms. The great majority of the advocates of woman suffrage would hold, for example, that at least two misstatements are contained in the following sentence taken from the first page of her pamphlet: "The claim is made that the laws on our statute books are unjust to the wage-earning woman, and that the only redress from this discrimination is the ballot." In the first place, suffragists do not claim that the working woman's "only" redress is through the ballot; they do say and believe that the ballot is the swiftest and most direct means of bringing about such reforms as are demanded; but, since they are denied the ballot, these same women are devoting a disproportionately large measure of time and strength in trying to bring about these reforms in other ways. In the second place so far as women in industry are concerned, suffragists are not so much disturbed about "laws on our statute books," which are unjust to the working woman, as they are about the very general absence of adequate protective legislation in her behalf.

"FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS FROM THE SHIRT-WAIST STRIKE."

The second section in Miss Bronson's pamphlet is devoted to "Fallacious arguments from the shirt-waist strike." It is claimed that a suffragist said in a public speech, "If the women engaged in this industry had had the ballot, such a strike as theirs would have been unnecessary." The antisuffrage comment is that the suffragists did not know that many of the strikers were either immigrants or were under 21. This again is a misrepresentation, probably due to a misunderstanding of the suffragist attitude. When we say that if women had a vote there would be an end of child labor and that young girls would work shorter hours, this does not mean that we think the children in the mills and factories and workshops are going to be allowed to vote. Remembering that in England conditions improved for all workingmen when some workmen got the vote, we believe that in this country, when some women get the vote, conditions for all working women will improve, and the day will come when there will be no working children.

LAWS FOR THE PROTECTION OF WAGE-EARNING MEN.

Not only has Miss Bronson evidently failed to understand the arguments put forth by the suffragists, but she has also failed to acquaint herself with the principles and history of labor legislation in the United States. She seems rather to have sought out for use in this pamphlet a few illustrations which may perhaps give an impression of superficial familiarity with the labor laws of the various States, but which indicate a lack of understanding of the facts about protective legislation. The opening paragraph (on p. 2) of her "comparative study" closes with the statement that "the laws enacted for the protection of wage-earning women are more beneficent and more far-reaching than the laws for the protection of wage-earning men." By way of comment, any fair-minded person need only recall the long series of statutes enacted in all the leading industrial States, covering a period of nearly three-fourths of a century, as a result of the efforts of workingmen to bring about through legislation a larger measure of justice than they could obtain through their attempts to bargain with individual employers. Thus we have the antitruck laws, laws providing for the weekly payment of wages, the mechanics' lien laws, the assignment of wages laws, laws making employees preferred creditors, laws providing for liability of stockholders for wage debts, exemption of workingmen's tools and wages from attachment for debt, laws requiring safety appliances and protection against accidents, laws allowing time to vote without loss of pay, laws preventing the coercion of employees in the exercise of suffrage, laws regulating prison labor, the trade union laws regarding blacklisting, protection of the union label, and so on; the laws providing for an eight-hour day for Federal, State, and municipal employees, nearly all of whom are men; the laws relating to mining and railroad labor, and many similar laws. Moreover, it should be understood that this legislation, although it may in a few cases protect the working woman as well as the workingman, represents the results of long years of earnest

struggle by workingmen with votes to improve their condition. And yet Miss Bronson entirely ignores this great mass of legislation enacted to protect the workingman, while she lays stress on the fact that some States have a few special provisions designed to protect wage-earning women from exploitation which is likely to injure their health and endanger the health of their children.

COMPARISON OF LAWS IN SUFFRAGE AND NONSUFFRAGE STATES.

The chief points of attack, however, in this antisuffrage pamphlet are (a) the fact that protective legislation for women is found on the statute books of some States where women do not vote, and that (b) in a few States where women do vote similar laws have not yet been passed. The questions at issue here are so confused by the method of presentation that it may be worth while to state them in some detail.

(a) The first point in Miss Bronson's argument is that protective legislation has been obtained in States where women do not vote. No suffragist would deny this. It is, of course, well known that most of this legislation was obtained through the laborious efforts of suffragists. American women would probably have got the vote long ago if they had followed the present English method of making suffrage a paramount issue first, last, and all the time. Instead of this, Miss Jane Addams in Illinois, Mrs. Florence Kelley in New York, and a host of other ardent suffragists have labored with the greatest devotion and self-sacrifice to secure protective legislation for women and children. How much effort they have put into it, how much time and energy it has cost, only those who have been closely associated with them know. It should not be forgotten that, as the result of their experience, they say that the ballot is the swiftest and surest way to bring about the reforms which are asked by and for the women workers of this country.

(b) A very different question is the point which the antisuffragist confuses with this—the fact that such protective legislation does not exist in some of the States in which women have the ballot. No argument on this point is worth noticing which ignores the special needs of these States. Colorado, Wyoming, Idaho, and Utah are all mining and agricultural States, and have very few wage-earning women who are employed in factories. It would be as foolish to reproach the women of Idaho for not protecting factory girls who do not exist as to reproach the men of Massachusetts because they have failed to pass irrigation laws. Massachusetts had 152,713 women employed in "manufacturing and mechanical pursuits" when the last United States census of occupations was taken; Idaho had only 681. A similar contrast might be drawn for any of the other States: Thus Wyoming had 501 women in industrial occupations, while New York in the same year had 136,788.

Miss Bronson attaches so much importance to her arguments on this point that they should, perhaps, be considered in greater detail. For example, she says that "39 States compel employers in stores, factories, shops, etc., to provide seats for female employees. Nine States have no such laws, and one of the nine States is a suffrage State." If conditions in all States were alike, this might indicate that States in which women vote give less protection to working women than States in which women do not vote. The one suffrage State, however, that fails to provide seats for saleswomen is Idaho, which according to the census had 153 saleswomen in the entire State at a time when Massachusetts had 11,985, Illinois 12,149, and New York 30,858.¹ Those who know the small store in the small western town know that the personal relation still exists between employer and clerk, and that the clerk is usually a mature woman who is not in the same need of protection as are the tens of thousands of young girls who stand behind the counters of the great city stores, who work under most arduous conditions, frequently under terrible pressure, and who never come in personal contact with their employers and have no opportunity of stating their needs. It should, moreover, be pointed out that in most of the 39 States where voteless women have secured these laws they have never been

¹ Mrs. Eva Hunt Dockery, who has served for 10 years on the legislative committee of the Idaho State Federation of Women's Clubs, wrote in the *Woman's Journal* of Dec. 17, 1910, in answer to Richard Barry's criticism, that Idaho had no law limiting women's factory hours:

"Idaho has no factories where women are employed, so the need of this law has not been felt. Up to a very few years ago there was not a department store in the State and the clerks in the stores were treated as they were in the good old days in the East, like members of the family."

given the means of enforcing them. They have obtained protective laws which protect no one.¹

HOURS OF WORK.

The next point is the fact that night work for women is not prohibited in Idaho, Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah. Why should it be? Is it a reproach to Rhode Island workmen that they have never secured an eight-hour day for miners? Ought the workmen of Nebraska to be disfranchised because they have not passed a law protecting seamen?

Legislation regarding the hours of labor for women is also discussed. Miss Bronson says that 31 States have passed laws restricting the hours, but that two of the suffrage States (Wyoming and Idaho) have not. It has already been pointed out that these two States had almost no wage-earning women in shops and factories who needed protection. Miss Bronson, however, makes a special point against suffrage in claiming that Colorado, a suffrage State which does limit the hours of labor for women, has a very inferior and inadequate law. She does not seem to have discovered that this law was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of Colorado, in 1907, and no longer exists on the statute books. It is interesting, however, to note how she uses it. Disregarding a statement about night work, which has already been referred to, her points against this law are so confused that it is best to disentangle them separately.

(1) It is claimed that the Colorado law, since it did not limit the hours per week, gave only "slight protection," while the Nebraska law limits the number of hours per week, "thereby insuring one day of rest." Miss Bronson does not state here that the Nebraska law provides for a 10-hour day and a 60-hour week and does not prohibit Sunday labor. It is difficult to see how Miss Bronson understands the law to insure one day of rest.² On the other hand, the Colorado law provided for an 8-hour day, and the number of hours per week was, by this fact, limited to 56. Since, however, the majority of employers do not want their work places open on Sunday, even when this is not prohibited by law, the limitation of an 8-hour day prescribed in the Colorado law made for the great majority of working women a 48-hour week, in contrast to the 60-hour week in the "neighboring States of Oklahoma, South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska," which Miss Bronson refers to with so much satisfaction.

¹ Mrs. Kelley in her "Ethical Gains through Legislation" (Macmillan, 1910, p. 200) gives the following account of the efforts of the Consumers' League to help the shop girl: "For years the friends of the young clerks in retail stores have striven to obtain for them the poor privilege of being seated when at work, and with what success? In many States laws have been enacted making diverse provisions for seats in stores. In New York City, for instance, the law has required, since 1896, that one seat be provided for every three clerks. In some stores the seats have been supplied for the third floor, because the clerks were chiefly employed upon the first. In many stores chairs are abundantly supplied in the fitting rooms of the cloak, tailoring, and dressmaking departments, for the use of customers, and are included in the general reckoning according to which there are, on the premises, chairs in the proportion of one to three clerks. In still other cases, chairs or seats are wholly absent from the notion counters and from the counters or tables in the aisles of the stores where half-grown girls serve as sales clerks. The absence of the seats is suavely explained by the fact that the employees are there only temporarily. But their employment lasts day after day, and the pretext is utterly transparent. In still other places seats are provided ostentatiously, but girls who use them are censured or dismissed. All these variations of the art of evading the statute have been found by the writer in reputable establishments in New York City."

Reference should also be made to a suffrage pamphlet by Mrs. Kelley, called "Persuasion or Responsibility?" in which she points out how child labor and compulsory education laws have in the same way turned out to be protective only in name, and she calls attention to the loss which results from the fact that the women who are "fitted by nature and by training to guard the welfare of the children are prevented by law from electing the officers who enforce the laws. For instance, the laws of New York are, in some respects, the most drastic and enlightened laws in the Republic. But the magistrates in New York City will not fine fathers who break the child-labor law and the compulsory-education law. * * * The commissioner of health makes no attempt to prosecute merchants and telegraph companies who employ children at night or without working papers. The present commissioner of police has not punished one parent for flagrant and wholesale violation of the 'newsboy law,' which forbids boys to work after 10 at night or before they are 10 years old. * * * If mothers and teachers voted in New York City, none of these things would occur. The same eager interest which has placed the child-labor law, the compulsory-education law, the newsboy law, and the juvenile-court law upon the statute books, would elect a mayor pledged to the enforcement of those laws."

² What Miss Bronson probably has in mind is the fact that Nebraska, in company with a large number of other States, has a law prohibiting Sunday labor which applies to both men and women. The fact that Colorado has no Sunday labor law, except one relating to barbers, would be quite as good an argument against suffrage for men as suffrage for women, since it is the men in the large metal-working establishments who are chiefly affected by the absence of Sunday laws. As these laws are very rarely enforced, it seems absurd to discuss them.

Attention must, in this connection, be once more called to the fact that it is little short of ridiculous to discuss these laws as if they were at genuinely protective through proper enforcement. One may only hope that when women vote they will make these so-called protective laws something more than records on the statute books.

(2) Miss Branson's knowledge of industrial conditions seems to be singularly at fault when she further criticizes the Colorado law because "the clause restricting its operation to women who must stand at their work renders it practically ineffective in the factories of that State, where the manufacturing is largely in what is termed 'seated' trades--ready-made clothing, dressmaking, millinery, and like occupations, and in candy making, box making, and cigar making. The great manufacturing establishments, where women must stand at work, like cotton and woolen manufacturing, carpet weaving, etc., are not located in Colorado."

This statement is so incorrect that it seemed best to quote it in full. Miss Bronson claims that in Colorado the great majority of women are employed in "seated" trades, and candy making, box making, and cigar making are cited as samples. But the last census of occupations¹ showed 65 women and girls in the entire State employed in candy making ("confectioners"), 11 in box making, and 30 in cigar making, in contrast to 1,184 saleswomen, 762 waitresses, and 1,599 in hand and steam laundries, and surely saleswomen, waitresses, and laundry workers are employed in standing trades.

UNSOUND COMPARISONS.

Miss Bronson seems to have been unable to resist the temptation that offered to make a few other misleading and unfair comparisons before closing this part of her argument. She calls attention to the fact that Massachusetts has a law prohibiting employers from deducting the wages of women when time is lost because machinery has broken down; and although it is, of course, well known that this law was passed to correct certain abuses to which women operatives in textile mills were subjected, Miss Bronson chooses to regard it as an argument against suffrage because the women of Idaho and Utah, Wyoming and Colorado have not wasted the time of their legislatures in enumerating their statute books with laws that were not needed.

Similarly absurd is her attempt to use as an argument against suffrage the fact that certain nonsuffrage States have statutes prohibiting the exclusion of women from occupations on account of sex. Miss Bronson should have known that these laws were passed because, in a few States, the courts took the position that, since women were not voters, they could not become practicing lawyers; and the statutes quoted were therefore necessary to correct this situation. In other States, the courts took a different attitude. One of the present writers, for example, was admitted to the Kentucky bar a good many years ago in order to test the question when it was raised in that State, and the position taken by the court when she was admitted made legislation on the subject unnecessary in that State; on the other hand, refusal of the court to admit Mrs. Myra Bradwell to the bar on the grounds of nonparticipation in government made a statute necessary in Illinois. The significant point is that in any State where women do participate in the government there is no ground on which the court can uphold their exclusion from the bar, and yet Miss Bronson argues that the women in the suffrage States ought not to have the right to vote because they have not passed laws which would be entirely superfluous in any State where women shared in the government, and which were never needed or passed save in two or three States where the courts took the position referred to.

REVIEW OF CONDITIONS IN THE SIX SUFFRAGE STATES.

Washington and California, the newer suffrage States, have eight-hour laws for women, but Miss Bronson says that these laws "were enacted under male suffrage." So far as Washington is concerned, this is not true. Before equal suffrage was adopted, the advocates of shorter hours for women in Washington had tried for eight years to secure an eight-hour law without success. After the ballot was granted to women the legislature promptly passed the law.

¹ Twelfth Census: Occupations, Table 33.

In California, the eight-hour law for women was passed a short time before equal suffrage was adopted; but, as it was passed by the same legislature which also passed the woman-suffrage amendment to the State constitution by a vote of 33 to 5 in the senate and 65 to 12 in the assembly, it certainly does not bear out Miss Bronson's claim that such protective legislation for woman is adopted "above all because she herself is not a lawmaker."

Colorado in 1903 passed an eight-hour law for women, but it was pronounced unconstitutional by the State supreme court in 1907. In the last Colorado Legislature a more carefully drawn eight-hour law for women passed the lower house with only one dissenting vote, but was blocked in the senate, like almost all other legislation in that year, by the deadlock over the election of a United States Senator.

Massachusetts has just passed a 54-hour a week law for women, as the culmination of about 40 years of effort by indirect influence to improve conditions for women in industry. Utah, in 1911, passed a nine-hour law for women, after less than two years of effort by its advocates.¹ Women with votes got this law from the first legislature of which they asked it.

To sum up: Of the six equal-suffrage States, three have passed eight-hour laws for women—though in Colorado the law was thrown out by the courts—and one a nine-hour law. Of the nonsuffrage States, not one has an eight-hour law for women,² and only five have nine-hour laws. The legislatures in most of the suffrage States have shown much greater readiness to protect women from overwork than the legislatures in most of the nonsuffrage States.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE NOT DEPENDENT ON HOURS OF TOIL.

There is not the slightest ground for Miss Bronson's inference that where a woman has the same right to vote as a man she "must give as many hours of toil per day as he."

Justice Brewer of the United States Supreme Court, himself a suffragist, wrote the opinion of that court upholding the constitutionality of legislation limiting women's hours of labor. The decision says in part:

"Even though all restrictions on political, personal, and contractual rights were taken away, and she—woman—stood, so far as statutes are concerned, upon an absolutely equal plane with him—man—it would still be true * * * that her physical structure and a proper discharge of her maternal function—having in view not merely her own health but the well-being of the race—justify legislation to protect her from the greed as well as the passion of man."

WAGES OF TEACHERS.

Leaving women in industry, Miss Bronson passes on to the wages of teachers. She calls attention to the suffragist argument that the ballot will lead "to fair treatment of women in public service," as indicated, for example, by the laws of Wyoming and Utah, which provide that women and men teachers shall receive equal pay for equal work; and she ends by saying impressively, "It is not denied that female teachers do not in the majority of cases receive the same pay as men for work of equal grade; but here the law of supply and demand is paramount, and legislation can not affect it." While it would be fruitless to go back to the "iron laws" of the early economists and to enter upon a long discussion of the outworn doctrine of the inflexibility and almost sacred character of supply and demand, one may briefly call attention to the fact that the supply of child labor has been very greatly reduced in many States and entirely cut off in others by means of protective legislation; and that in still other States the demand for child labor has greatly decreased as the result of inconvenient

¹ Mrs. Elizabeth M. Cohen, of Salt Lake City, chairman of the industrial committee of the State Federation of Women's Clubs, told, in the Woman's Journal, of May 27, 1911, how this was accomplished. The cooperation of women's organizations with an aggregate of 50,000 members was secured. Mrs. Cohen says:

"The large number of women represented was both inspiring and appalling—inspiring the (women's) committee to give the best that was in them, and appalling to the legislator who would like to be reelected two years hence and realized that 50,000 votes stood back of that representation. His discomfiture was increased by the knowledge that some of his constituents, who were identified with corporations and special interests, would demand an accounting. The 50,000 votes prevailed. * * * If we had not had the vote we should not have succeeded."

² Arizona has an eight-hour law applying only to women in laundries.

protective provisions in child-labor laws, and the demand for the labor of men and women has correspondingly increased.¹

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, it should perhaps be explained that this little pamphlet was written merely to point out Miss Bronson's failure to understand the suffragist argument, which she attempts to criticise, and to call attention to the fact that her knowledge of labor legislation was not such as to make her a reliable guide in discussing the subject. It is not necessary here to show that Miss Bronson misleads by refusing to note the obviously good laws which have been passed since women obtained a vote. It may be well, however, once more to call attention to the fact that the beneficial results which suffragists believe will accrue to working women when they have the vote will many of them be indirect and cumulative through a long period of time. While they are none the less valuable for this reason, it should be clearly understood that suffragists do not believe that within the first year or even within the first decade during which women have the right to vote, all possible reforms will be immediately accomplished. At the time when Miss Bronson's pamphlet was published, Idaho had been a suffrage State for 14 years, and yet her pamphlet is largely devoted to showing that women ought not to be allowed to vote anywhere,

¹ Miss Alice Stone Blackwell has kindly contributed the following interesting statement regarding Miss Bronson's discussion of teachers' salaries.

The average pay of male teachers in Massachusetts is about three times that of women teachers. Miss Bronson says, with truth, that it would be misleading to infer that the proportional difference is so great when the men and women are doing the same work. She immediately goes on to make an elaborate argument, on the same misleading basis, in the endeavor to prove that women teachers do not get as good treatment in the suffrage States as elsewhere.

Let it be kept clearly in mind that the claim of the women teachers is for equal pay when they hold positions involving equal work and equal responsibility—not that an exact half of all the more highly paid and responsible places shall be held by women.

The law of Wyoming and Utah, and the custom in the other suffrage States, is that women teachers shall receive the same pay as men when they do work of the same grade. Miss Bronson claims that women do not get it in Wyoming and Utah, "in spite of the law on their statute books to the contrary," because the average pay of women teachers in those States is not equal to that of the men. The law does not say that their average pay shall be the same. It does say that their pay shall be the same when they perform the same work; and this law is enforced.

A majority of the higher teaching positions are held by men in the suffrage States as well as elsewhere. This is a condition of things which will long outlast women's disfranchisement.

In Wyoming and other Western States, where women are largely outnumbered by men and the pressure upon the teachers to marry is very strong, the number of women who remain in the profession long enough to fit themselves for the highest positions is naturally small. But in the suffrage States all educational positions are open to women, even that of State superintendent of public instruction, and the salary is graded according to position, not according to sex.

The figures given by Miss Bronson as to the average pay of men and women teachers in different States are therefore wholly irrelevant to the question of whether they get equal pay for equal work.

Entirely misleading, also, is her statement in regard to the actual wages paid to women teachers. Eleven States, she says (4 of them suffrage States, by the way), pay women teachers higher monthly wages than Wyoming and Utah. Everybody knows that teachers are paid more in city schools than in the country, both because the work is harder and because the cities are richer. Wyoming has not a single large city, and Utah has only one. Yet Miss Bronson presents it as an argument against woman suffrage that 7 out of the 42 nonsuffrage States pay women higher monthly salaries than these two suffrage States. Is it not more significant that Wyoming and Utah actually pay their women teachers at a higher rate than the much richer States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Oregon and more than a score of others?

In all the enfranchised States equal suffrage has helped the schools. Mrs. Julia Ward Howe sent a circular letter to all the editors, and to all the ministers of four leading denominations in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Idaho, asking them what benefits, if any, had resulted from women's ballot. Out of the 624 answers received only 62 were unfavorable; and among the benefits most often cited by the ministers and editors was that equal suffrage had made it easier to get liberal appropriations for education.

Miss Bronson refers to the recent law granting the women teachers in New York City equal pay with the men when they do equal work. She says: "It is worth noting that this law was passed in a male suffrage State by a legislature elected by male suffrage." It is worth noting, also, that the teachers had to put in six years of hard and exhausting work to get it by "indirect influence," while in the suffrage States the same result has come about almost automatically, without any labor on their part. It is also worth noting that Miss Grace Strachan, who led the teachers' campaign in New York, is a suffragist, and, like Miss Margaret Haley and almost all the women teachers who have led successful fights for the better pay, she believes that their work would have been much easier if they had had the ballot; and she testifies that the difficulties which they met have converted the teachers to suffrage in shoals.

because in Idaho, a State in which the number of women is proportionately very much smaller than the number of men, the small minority of voting women had not in 14 years placed upon the statute books not only the laws which were needed in that State but also an elaborate industrial code protecting factory women who did not exist. For example, during the first session of the legislature after the women secured the vote in Colorado, and within three years in Idaho and in Utah, a much-needed form of protection was given to girls by raising the so-called "age of consent" from 14 to 18. When the need of industrial protection is felt, similarly effective measures will undoubtedly be passed. In the meantime is it fair to charge that the women of these States have furnished an argument against suffrage, because they have not secured in a few years all of the laws developed out of a century's experience with factory conditions in the more highly organized industrial States, when these laws would be superfluous in the far Western States in which they live?

It is of interest that the working women themselves believe that they will have a more equal footing in the industrial struggle when they have the protection of the vote, and that the women's trade unions of this country and of England¹ are in the front ranks of suffrage advocates. One who thinks earnestly about the position of working women can never overlook the enormous indirect consequence of the ballot—the gain in education, in independence, in self-reliance, and therefore the gain for working women in the ability to organize. Everyone believes that the privilege of voting is educative in many ways. Working women are only asking that they should not be denied this instrument of education and protection, which no one would now think of denying to the workingman. To quote Mrs. Kelley again, "For any body of wage earners to be disfranchised is to be placed at an intolerable disadvantage in all matters of legislation."

"WOMAN SUFFRAGE COEQUAL WITH MAN SUFFRAGE."

[From the platform of principles of the American Federation of Labor.]

"I am for unqualified woman suffrage as a matter of human justice. * * * It is unfair that women should be governed by laws in the making of which they have no voice. * * * Men would feel that they were used badly if they did not have that right, and women naturally feel the same." (Samuel Gompers, president American Federation of Labor.)

"I'm in perfect harmony with the declaration of the American Federation of Labor which has indorsed the demand that women be given the right to vote. * * * I have always stood for the square deal, and that's the only square thing on the woman-suffrage question, as I see it. * * * I personally believe that it would be for the good of us all for women to be enfranchised." (John Mitchell, ex-president United Mine Workers of America.)

"I would advise all the workers of America to work for woman suffrage." (Keir Hardie, M. P., Independent Labor Party.)

"The lack of direct political influence constitutes a powerful reason why women's wages have been kept at a minimum." (Hon. Carroll D. Wright, late United States Commissioner of Labor.)

"Nothing tells the location of our hearts more surely than the figures of the tax list. Colorado spends the highest amount per capita for educational pur-

¹ An extremely interesting phase of the suffrage movement in England which has been much neglected because it is not spectacular nor militant furnishes valuable testimony from the ranks of the workers themselves as to the value they place upon the vote. They make but one appeal, "the political freedom of the poorest of the workers." An extract from one of the tracts issued by the skilled women workers of the north of England to the less competent women of the south may be of interest: "In the old days men suffered as women do now, but since they got political power they have altered all that; they have been able to enforce a much fairer rate of wages. It is the women who are sweated * * * we who have no labor representation to protect us * * * without political power in England it is impossible to get industrial justice or a fair return for your labor. * * * The cheap labor of women is not a local difficulty that can be remedied by local means; it is a national difficulty, and nothing less than a national reform giving women the protection of political power can make any really effective change in their position. So we are agitating for votes for women, and we appeal to you to join our ranks." Again, one of their "textile tracts" points out that the position of the voteless working woman is a forlorn and difficult one. "She has no social or political influence to back her. Her trade union stands or falls by its power of negotiating; it can not hope to have the weight with employers that the men's unions have, for instead of being a strong association of voters * * * it is merely a band of workers carrying on an almost hopeless struggle to improve conditions of work and wages. * * * A vote in itself is a small thing, but the aggregate vote of a great union is a very different matter." (See *Atlantic Monthly*, vol. 102, "The English working woman and the franchise.")

poses of any State in the Union." (Helen Loring Grenfell, for three terms Colorado State superintendent of public instruction.)

"I saw by the papers that the governor of Massachusetts lately signed the 54-hour law for women and children, but it was stated that he did so with hesitation, and only upon a promise that no further reduction of hours would be sought for some years to come. On the same day he signed a bill limiting to 48 hours a week the time that men should be employed on public works. He expressed no hesitation about that. Do grown-up men employed at public work need more protection than women and little children working in factories and cotton mills? What was the reason for this difference? There is only one answer: Women and children can not vote." (Owen Lovejoy, secretary of the National Child Labor Committee.)

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

[By Alice Stone Blackwell.]

WHY SHOULD WOMEN VOTE?

The reasons why women should vote are the same as the reasons why men should vote—the same as the reasons for having a republic rather than a monarchy. It is fair and right that the people who must obey the laws should have a choice in choosing the lawmakers, and that those who must pay the taxes should have a voice as to the amount of the tax, and the way in which the money shall be spent.

Roughly stated, the fundamental principle of a republic is this: In deciding what is to be done, we take everybody's opinion, and then go according to the wish of the majority. As we can not suit everybody we do what will suit the greatest number. That seems to be, on the whole, the fairest way. A vote is simply a written expression of opinion.

In thus taking a vote to get at the wish of the majority certain classes of persons are passed over, whose opinions for one reason or another are thought not to be worth counting. In most of our States these classes are children, allens, idiots, lunatics, criminals, and women. There are good and obvious reasons for making all these exceptions but the last. Of course no account ought to be taken of the opinions of children, insane persons, or criminals. Is there any equally good reason why no account should be taken of the opinions of women? Let us consider the reasons commonly given, and see if they are sound.

ARE WOMEN REPRESENTED?

Women are represented already by their husbands, fathers, and brothers.—This so-called representation bears no proportion to numbers. Here is a man who has a wife, a widowed mother, four or five unmarried sisters, and half a dozen unmarried daughters. His vote represents himself and all these women, and it counts one; while the vote of his bachelor neighbor next door, without a female relative in the world, counts for just as much. Since the object of taking a vote is to get at the wish of the majority it is clear that the only fair and accurate way is for each grown person to have one vote and cast it to represent himself or herself.

American men are the best in the world, and if it were possible for any men to represent women, through kindness and good will to them, American men would do it. But a man is by nature too different from a woman to be able to represent her. The two creatures are unlike. Whatever his good will he can not fully put himself in a woman's place and look at the things exactly from her point of view. To say this is no more a reflection upon his mental or moral ability than it would be a reflection upon his musical ability to say that he can not sing both soprano and bass. Unless men and women should ever become just alike (which would be regrettable and monotonous) women must either go unrepresented or represent themselves.

Another proof that women's opinions are not now fully represented is the lack in many States of humane and protective legislation and the poor enforcement of such legislation where it exists; the inadequate appropriations for schools; the permission of child labor in factories; and, in general, the imperfect legal safeguarding of the moral, educational, and humanitarian interests that

women have most at heart. In many of our States the property laws are more or less unequal as between men and women. A hundred years ago, before the equal-rights movement began, they were almost incredibly unequal. Yet our grandfathers loved their wives and daughters as much as men do to-day.

IS "INFLUENCE" ENOUGH?

If the laws are unjust, they can be corrected by women's indirect influence.—Yes; but the indirect method is needlessly long and hard. If women were forbidden to use the direct route by rail across the continent and complained of the injustice, it would be no answer to tell them that it is possible to get from New York to San Francisco by going around Cape Horn.

The slowness with which some of the worst inequalities in the laws are corrected shows the unsatisfactoriness of the indirect way. In most States a married mother has literally no legal rights over her own children so long as she and her husband live together. Here is a case which actually happened, and which might happen to-day in 31 out of the 48 States of the Union:

A Chinaman had married a respectable Irish woman. When their first baby was three days old the husband gave it to his brother to be taken to China and brought up there. The mother, through the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, appealed to the courts. But the judge promptly decided that the husband was within his rights. He was the sole legal owner of the baby; he had the sole legal right to say what should be done with it. For more than half a century the suffragists of the United States have been trying to secure legislation making the father and mother joint guardians of their children by law, as they are by nature, but thus far the equal-guardianship law has been obtained in only 16 States and the District of Columbia. Massachusetts got it in 1902, after 55 years of effort by Massachusetts women. In Colorado and in California, after women were given the right to vote, the very next legislature passed an equal-guardianship law.

In Massachusetts the State Federation of Women's Clubs, the Women's Relief Corps, the State W. C. T. U., the Children's Friend Society, and 65 other associations united in asking for the bill. The only society of women that has ever ranged itself definitely on the wrong side of this question is the "Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women." It circulated for years, under its official imprint, a leaflet in defense of the old law which gave the husband the sole control of the children.

In Massachusetts in 1902 the laws of inheritance between husband and wife were made equal, but it had taken more than half a century of work to secure this self-evidently just measure. The experience in many other States has been similar. The roundabout way is almost always long and slow.

THE IGNORANT VOTE.

It would double the ignorant vote.—Statistics published by the National Bureau of Education show that the high schools of every State in the Union are graduating more girls than boys—some of them twice and three times as many. Because of the growing tendency to take boys out of school early in order to put them into business girls are getting more schooling than boys. Equal suffrage would increase the proportion of voters who have received more than a merely elementary education.

THE FOREIGN VOTE.

It would double the foreign vote.—Less than one-third of the immigrants coming to this country are women. According to the census of 1911, there are in the United States nearly three times as many native-born women (38,673,693) as all the foreign-born men and foreign-born women put together (13,343,583).

The foreign vote is objectionable only so far as it is an ignorant vote. Intelligent foreigners, both men and women, are often very valuable citizens. On the other hand, the ignorant foreign immigrants who come here are fully imbued, both men and women, with all the Old World ideas as to the inferiority and subjection of women. It is not until they have become pretty thoroughly Americanized that they can tolerate the idea of women's voting. The husbands are not willing that their wives should vote, and the wives ridicule the suggestion. Experience shows that until they have become Americanized the foreign women will not vote. And after they have become Americanized why should they not vote as well as anyone else?

THE CRIMINAL VOTE.

To the vote of every criminal man you would add the vote of a criminal woman.—The vicious and criminal class is comparatively small among women. In the prisons of the United States as a whole, including those for all kinds of offences, women constitute only 5½ per cent of the prisoners, and the proportion is growing smaller.

Equal suffrage would increase the moral and law-abiding vote very largely, while increasing the vicious and criminal vote very little. This is a matter not of conjecture, but of statistics.

THE BAD WOMEN'S VOTE.

The bad women would outvote the good ones.—In America the bad women are so few compared with the good ones that their votes could have little influence. Mrs. Helen Gilbert Ecob, wife of a prominent clergyman who was for some years a pastor in Denver, writes:

"The bad women represent in any city of the United States but an infinitesimal proportion of its population, and the vote of that class in Denver is confined practically to 3 precincts out of 120."

The late Mrs. Sarah Platt Decker, of Denver, at one time president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and also of the Colorado State board of charities and correction, wrote:

"Does not the vote of the disreputable class of women overbalance the better element? No; the women of the half-world are not willing to vote. They are constantly changing their residences and their names. They do not wish to give any data concerning themselves, their age, name, or number and street; they prefer to remain unidentified."

Ex-Gov. Warren, of Wyoming, sums it all up when he says, in a letter to Horace G. Wadlin, of Massachusetts:

"Our women nearly all vote; and since, in Wyoming as elsewhere, the majority of women are good and not bad, the result is good and not evil."

DON'T UNDERSTAND BUSINESS.

A municipality is a great business corporation. Men, by the nature of their occupations, know more about business than women, and hence are better fitted to run a city or a State.—Women have a vote in every other corporation in which they are shareholders. George William Curtis said: "A woman may vote as a stockholder upon a railroad from one end of the country to the other; but if she sells her stock and buys a house with the money, she has no voice in the laying out of the road before her door, which her house is taxed to keep and pay for."

Moreover, it is not true that a man's experience in his own business teaches him how to carry on the business of a city. Some years ago a fashionable caterer was elected to the Massachusetts Legislature and was appointed a member of the committee on filling up the South Boston flats. Another member said to him scornfully, "What do you know about filling up flats, anyway?" The caterer answered quietly, "That has been my business for 20 years." The answer was good, as a joke; but as a matter of fact, what had his experience of planning dinners taught him about the way to turn tide mud into solid ground? What does the butcher learn from his business about the best way to pave a street, or the baker about the best way to build a sewer, or the candlestick maker about the best way to lay out a park, or to choose school-teachers or policemen, or to run a city hospital? Does a minister learn from his profession how to keep the streets clean, or a lawyer how to conduct a public school, or a doctor how to put out a fire? A man's business, at best, gives him special knowledge only in regard to one or two departments of city affairs. Women's business, as mothers and housekeepers, also gives them special knowledge in regard to some important departments of public work—those relating to children, schools, playgrounds, the protection of the weak and young, morals, the care of the poor, etc. For what lies outside the scope of their own experience, men and women alike must rely upon experts. All they need as voters is sense enough and conscience enough to elect honest and capable persons to have charge of these things.

DIVISION OF LABOR.

The growth of civilization is marked by an increasing specialization and division of labor; woman suffrage would therefore be a step backward.—The growth of civilization increases the division of labor as between individuals, but lessens it as between the sexes. One woman no longer spins and weaves, and manufactures the clothing for the men of her family, at the same time carrying on all the housework, and in addition making butter, cheese, and candles, as our great-grandmothers did. This work is now subdivided among a number of specialists. On the other hand, in the old times women were excluded from almost all the occupations of men. Housework and sewing were practically the only ways open to them to earn a living. To-day, out of more than 300 trades and professions followed by men, women are found in all but three or four.

But this objection about the subdivision of labor is really irrelevant. Voting is not labor in the sense of a trade or a profession. The tendency of civilization has been to a greater and greater specialization of labor, but not to a closer and closer restriction of the suffrage. On the contrary, that has been steadily extended. The best results are found, not where public affairs are left in the hands of a small class of "professional politicians," but where the largest proportion of the people take a keen interest and an active part in their own government.

WOULD LOSE THEIR INFLUENCE.

Women would lose their influence.—What gives a woman influences? Beauty, goodness, tact, talent, pleasant manners, money, social position, etc. A woman who has any of these means of influence now would still have them if she had a vote and she would have this other potent means of influence besides. There is a story of a prisoner who had been shut up for many years in a dungeon, getting sunlight only through a chink in the wall. He grew much attached to that chink. At last his friends came and offered to tear down the wall. His mind had become weakened and he begged them not to do it. If they destroyed the wall, he said, they would also destroy the chink through which he got all his sunlight, and he would be left in total darkness. If he had had his wits, he would have seen that he would have all the sunlight he had before, and a great deal more besides. A woman after enfranchisement would have all the personal influence she has now, and political influence in addition. One thing is certain. Every vicious interest in this country, to which women are hostile, would rather continue to contend with women's "indirect influence" than try to cope with women's vote.

CEASE TO BE RESPECTED.

Women would cease to be respected.—Jane Addams and other prominent Chicago women testify to the marked increase of respect that came to the women of Illinois with the granting of the ballot.

Dr. Margaret Long, of Denver, daughter of the former Secretary of the Navy, writes: "It seems to me impossible that anyone can live in Colorado long enough to get into touch with the life here and not realize that women count for more in all the affairs of this State than they do where they have not the power the suffrage gives. More attention is paid to their wishes and much greater weight given to their opinions and judgment."

The late Mrs. Sarah Platt Decker, of Denver, wrote: "Under equal suffrage there is a much more chivalrous devotion and respect on the part of men, who look upon their sisters not as playthings or as property, but as equals and fellow citizens."

Mrs. K. A. Sheppard, president of the New Zealand Council of Women, says: "Since women have become electors their views have become important and command respect. Men listen to and are influenced by the opinions of women to a far greater degree than formerly. A young New Zealander in his teens no longer regards his mother as belonging to a sex that must be kept within a prescribed sphere, but as a human being clothed with the dignity of all those rights and powers which he hopes to enjoy within a few years. That the lads and young men of a democracy should have their whole conception of the rights of humanity broadened and measured by truer standards is in itself an incalculable benefit."

Mrs. A. Watson Lister, secretary of the Woman's National Council of Australia, says:

"One striking result of equal suffrage is that members of Parliament now consult us as to their bills, when these bear upon the interests of women. The author of the new divorce bill asked all the women's organizations to come together and hear him read it, and to make criticisms and suggestions. I do not remember any such thing happening before in all my years in Australia. When a naturalization bill was pending, one clause of which deprived Australian women of citizenship if they married aliens, a few women went privately to the prime minister and protested, and that clause was altered immediately. After we had worked for years with members of Parliament for various reforms without avail, because we had no votes, you can not imagine the difference it makes."—(Woman's Journal, Feb. 13, 1904.)

WOULD MAKE WOMEN PARTISANS.

Women can do more good now than if they had a vote, because now they are nonpartisan. If they became voters their nonpartisan influence would be lost.—Women continue to be nonpartisan after they have the ballot, and it gives them more power to secure the good things which the women of all parties want.

Prof. Henry E. Kelly, formerly of the Iowa State University, now practicing law in Denver, says in an open letter to State Senator A. H. Gale, of Iowa, that he went to Colorado opposed to equal suffrage, but has been converted by what he has seen of it. Prof. Kelly adds:

"Experience clearly shows that women's interest can not be aroused in mere partisan strife. Their interests center around questions affecting education, public cleanliness, public morality, civic beauty, charities and correction, public health, public libraries, and such subjects as more intimately affect home life and conduce to the prosperity of the family. Men lose sight of these important considerations in the scramble of partisan warfare for office, but women will not see them obscured by anything."

Ellis Meredith, of Denver, writes:

"There has never been a party measure espoused by women in the Colorado Legislature. The women of all parties want the same things and have worked for them together in perfect harmony. They wanted a pure-food law and secured one from their legislature in line with the national legislation. They wanted civil service reform, and have obtained that, so far as the officers of the State institutions are concerned. In a recent legislature an attempt was made to take the control of the State bureau of child and animal protection away from the Colorado Humane Society and to create a political board. Every federated woman's club in the State besieged its senators and representatives to vote against the bill, and the vice chairmen of the State central committees of the two chief political parties (both of them women) went together to different members of the legislature to enter their protest. Men understand that in legislative matters when they oppose the women they are opposing practically all the women and the great independent vote of the State."—(Woman's Journal, Aug. 21, 1907.)

OPPOSITION OF WOMEN.

Women in large numbers are organizing against suffrage; the majority are opposed to it and the majority ought to rule.—The organized opposition among women to suffrage is very small compared with the organized movement of women in its favor. Out of our 48 States only 17 have antisuffrage organizations of any kind. There are suffrage associations in 42.

In New York, at the time of the last constitutional convention, the suffragists secured more than 300,000 signatures to their petitions; the antisuffragists, only 15,000. In Chicago, 97 organizations, with an aggregate membership of more than 10,000 women, petitioned for a woman suffrage clause in the city charter, while only one small organization of women petitioned against it. In Maine, in Iowa, in short, in every State where petitions for suffrage and remonstrances against it have been sent to the legislature, the petitioners have always outnumbered the remonstrants, and have generally outnumbered them 50 or 100 to 1. On the only occasion when the Government took an official referendum among women on the subject (in Massachusetts, in 1895), the women's vote was in favor of suffrage more than 25 to 1. Less than one-sixth of one per cent of the women in the State voted against it.

Julia Ward Howe said: "Most women are as yet indifferent on the suffrage question; but, of those who take any lively interest in it either way, the great majority are in favor. This has been demonstrated wherever the matter has been brought to a test." (*Woman's Journal*, Aug. 1, 1908.)

Every constitutional amendment that has ever been carried in New York or Massachusetts would have been set down as defeated if all the men too indifferent to vote upon it either way had been counted as opposed. In New York, a successful amendment seldom gets more than 25 per cent of the popular vote, the remaining per cent are either indifferent or opposed, but, if less than 25 per cent are actually opposed, the amendment is carried.

In Massachusetts the Anti-Suffrage Association has been collecting signatures of women against suffrage since 1895, and in 18 years it has not succeeded in getting the names of 4 per cent of the women of the State. In the country at large, despite urgent and widely published appeals from the antis, not 1 per cent of the women have ever expressed any objection to suffrage. Why should the less than 1 per cent who protest claim to carry any more weight than the 99 per cent who either want the ballot or do not object to it.

ALREADY OVERBURDENED.

Women are already overburdened. A woman would not have time to perform her political duties without neglecting higher duties.—Mrs. Alice Freeman Palmer wrote:¹ "How much time must she spend on her political duties? If she belongs to the well-to-do class, and hires others to do her work, she has time for whatever interests her most—only let these interests be noble! If she does her own housework, she can take 10 minutes to stop on her way to market and vote once or twice a year. She can find half an hour a day for the newspapers and other means of information. She can talk with family and friends about what she reads. She does this now; she will then do it more intelligently and will give and receive more from what she says and hears. If she does this reading and talking, she will be better informed than the majority of voters are now.

"The duties of motherhood and the making of a home are the most sacred work of women and the dearest to them, of every class. If casting an intelligent vote would interfere with what only women can do—and what, failed in, undermines society and government—no one can question which a woman must choose. But it can not be shown that there are any large number of women in this country who have not the necessary time to vote intelligently, and it can be argued that study of the vital questions of our Government would make them better comrades to their husbands and friends, better guides to their sons, and more interesting and valuable members of society. Women of every class have more leisure than men, are less tied to hours of routine; they have had more years of school training than men. All this makes simple the combination of public and higher duties."

WOMEN AND OFFICEHOLDING.

If women vote, they must hold office.—When we say that women would be eligible to hold office what do we mean? Simply that if a majority of the people in any place would rather have a woman to hold a certain position than anyone else, and if she is willing to serve, they shall be allowed to elect her. Women are serving as officials already; some of the women most prominent in opposing equal suffrage have been holders of public office. The late president of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women (Mrs. J. Elliott Cabot) was for years a member of the school board of Brookline and also overseer of the poor. Yet that association, in its published documents, objects to equal suffrage, on the ground that "suffrage involves the holding of office, and officeholding is incompatible with the duties of most women." Suffrage does not involve officeholding by the majority of women, but only by a few; and there are always some women of character and ability who could give the necessary time. Women, as a class, have more leisure than men.

In the enfranchised States there has been no rush of women into office, and the offices that women do hold are mainly educational and charitable.

¹ Objections to woman suffrage answered by college women.

BALLOTS AND BULLETS.

If women vote they ought to fight and do police duty.—If no men were allowed to vote except those who were able and willing to do military and police duty women might consistently be debarred for that reason. But so long as the old, the infirm, the halt, the lame, and the blind are freely admitted to the ballot box some better reason must be found for excluding women than the fact that they do not fight. All men over 45 are exempt from military service, yet they vote. Col. T. Higginson says: "It appears by the record of United States military statistics that out of the men examined for military duty during the Civil War, of journalists, 740 in every 1,000 were found unfit; of preachers, 974; of physicians, 680; of lawyers, 544."

"Grave divines are horrified at the thought of admitting women to vote when they can not fight, though not one in twenty of their own number is fit for military duty if he volunteered. Of the editors who denounce woman suffrage only about one in four could himself carry a musket; while of the lawyers who fill Congress the majority could not be defenders of their country, but could only be defended."

Lucy Stone said, "Some woman risks her life whenever a soldier is born into the world. Later she does picket duty over his cradle, and for years she is his quartermaster and gathers his rations. And when that boy grows to a man, shall he say to his mother, 'If you want to vote you must first go and kill somebody'? It is a coward's argument."

Mrs. Z. G. Wallace, of Indiana, from whom Gen. Lew Wallace drew the portrait of the mother in "Ben Hur," said: "If women do not fight, they give to the State all its soldiers." This ought in all fairness to be taken as an offset for the military service that women do not render. As Lady Henry Somerset says, "She who bears soldiers does not need to bear arms."

CAN LAWS BE ENFORCED?

Laws could not be enforced unless the majority of legal voters represented the majority of possible fighters.—But thousands of male noncombatants are already admitted to the ballot box, and there is no certainty at any election that the majority of voters represent a majority of possible fighters. No trouble of this kind has resulted from equal suffrage in practice. The laws are as well enforced in the enfranchised States as in adjoining States where women have no vote.

Where women have school suffrage their votes occasionally turn the scale, but there is never any attempt to install the defeated candidates by force. Where women have the full ballot they have often defeated bad candidates for higher offices, but no riotous uprising has ever followed. This particular objection is a libel on American manhood.

WILL IT INCREASE DIVORCE?

It will lead to family quarrels and increase divorce.—Full suffrage was granted to the women of Wyoming in 1869. During the 20 years from 1870 to 1890 divorce in the United States at large increased about three times as fast as the population. In the group of western States, omitting Wyoming, it increased nearly four times as fast as the population. In Wyoming it increased only about half as fast as the population. "An ounce of experiment is worth a ton of theory."

Rev. Francis Miner Moody, secretary of the California commission working to secure a uniform divorce law throughout the United States, published in the Woman Voter of February, 1913, an article showing by actual statistics that every State which has had equal suffrage for a considerable number of years has declined markedly in its divorce rate as compared with the rest of the country. He points out that in Colorado the drop was so great as to be "astounding."

Just before Colorado granted equal suffrage, in 1891 and 1892, its average number of divorces per year was 937. For the three years immediately following the bestowal of equal suffrage—1894, 1895, and 1896—the average number of divorces per year was only 517.

¹ Medical statistics of the provost general's bureau quoted by Col. T. W. Higginson in "Common Sense About Women," p. 365.

A father sometimes turns his son out of doors for voting the wrong ticket, but among American men this is rare. Where such a case does arise, it is to be met by educating the domestic despot, not by disfranchising all the members of the family but one. A couple who are sensible and good-tempered will not quarrel if they are once in a while unable to think alike about politics. A couple who are not sensible and good-tempered are sure to quarrel anyway—if not about politics, then about something else.

THE QUESTION OF CHIVALRY.

It will destroy chivalry.—Justice would be worth more to women than chivalry, if they could not have both. A working girl put the case in a nutshell when she said: "I would gladly stand for 20 minutes in the street car going home if by doing so I could get the same pay that a man would have had for doing my day's work." But women do not have to stand in the street cars half as often in Denver as in Boston or in New York. Justice and chivalry are not in the least incompatible. Women have more freedom and equality in America than in Europe, yet American men are the most chivalrous in the world.

KNOWN BY ITS ENEMIES.

It would increase the corruption of politics.—Those who thrive upon the corruption of politics do not think so. The ignorant, vicious, and criminal vote is always cast solidly against equal rights for women.

TOO EMOTIONAL.

Women are too emotional and sentimental to be trusted with the ballot.—Mrs. E. T. Brown, at a meeting of the Georgia State Federation of Women's Clubs, read a paper, in which she said:

"You tell us that women are not fitted for dealing with the problems of government, being too visionary and too much controlled by sentiment.

"Now, it is very true of women that they are largely controlled by sentiment, and, as a matter of fact, men are largely controlled by sentiment also, in spite of their protesting blushes. Was it logic that swept like a wave over this country and sent our Army to protect the Cubans when their suffering grew too intense to be endured even in the hearing? Is it shrewd business calculation that sends thousands of dollars out of this country to feed a starving people during the ever-recurring famines in unhappy India? Was it hard common sense that sent thousands of American soldiers into what looked like the death trap of China in the almost baseless hope of rescuing a few hundred American citizens? Do not men like Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Lee live in the hearts of American men, not alone for what they did, but still more for what they dreamed of? The man who is not controlled by sentiment betrays his friends, sells his vote, is a traitor to his country, or wrecks himself, body and soul, with immoralities; for nothing but sentiment prevents any of these things. The sense of honor is pure sentiment. The sentiment of loyalty is the only thing that makes truth and honesty desirable, or a vote a nonsalable commodity.

"Government would be a poor affair without sentiment, and is not likely to be damaged by a slightly increased supply."

WHAT IS THE UNIT?

The political unit is the family.—The childless widower, the unmarried boy of 21, and the confirmed old bachelor of 90 have votes; the widow with minor children has none. Under our laws the political unit is not the family, but the male individual. The unequal number of grown persons in different families would make it impossible to treat the family as the political unit.

WOMEN'S SMALL SCHOOL VOTE.

The smallness of women's school vote shows that they would not use the full ballot.—The size of men's vote is just in proportion to the size of the election. At presidential elections it is very large, at State elections much smaller, at a municipal election smaller still, and at school elections, wherever these are held separately, only a fraction of the men turn out to vote. The smallness of the woman's school vote is regrettable, but it is only a new proof of the truth of

Mrs. Poyser's immortal saying: "I am not denying that women are foolish; God Almighty made them to match the men!"

In Kansas women were given school suffrage in 1861. Their vote was small. In 1887 they were given municipal suffrage. Their vote at once became much larger, and has increased at successive elections. In 1912 they were given the full ballot, and their vote increased much more.

In Colorado women were given school suffrage in 1876. Their vote was small. In 1893 they were given the full ballot, and on January 31, 1899, the Colorado Legislature declared, by a practically unanimous vote of both houses, that "during this time (the preceding five years) women have exercised the privilege as generally as men."

In the States of Oregon and Washington women had the school ballot for many years, and their vote was small. Now that they have gained full suffrage it has become large.

The women's school vote has completely disproved the fear that the bad women would be the first to rush to the polls. In answer to the prediction that the best women will not vote, Col. Higginson says:¹ "In Massachusetts under school suffrage the complaint has been that only the best women vote."

WILL WOMEN VOTE?

Women will not vote or will cease to vote after the novelty has worn off.—In Wyoming women have had full suffrage since 1869. The Wyoming secretary of state, in a letter to Miss Alice Stone Blackwell, of Boston, says that 90 per cent of them vote. (*Woman's Journal*, May 6, 1905.)

The Colorado secretary of state, in a letter to Mrs. Charles Park, of Boston, says that 80 per cent of Colorado women register and about 72 per cent vote. (*Woman's Journal*, Aug. 20, 1908.)

The chief justice of Idaho and all the justices of the State supreme court have signed a published statement that "The large vote cast by the women establishes the fact that they take a lively interest." (*Woman's Journal*, Aug. 20, 1908.)

In Australia, in the first elections after the women were enfranchised, which took place in 1903, 359,315 women voted; in 1906, 431,033; and in 1910, 601,946.

When woman suffrage was granted in New Zealand in 1893 the estimated number of women in the country was 139,915. Of these, 109,461 registered to vote, and the number of women voting has increased at each triennial parliamentary election since. In 1893, 90,290 women voted; in 1896, 108,783; in 1899, 119,550; in 1902, 138,565; in 1905, 175,046; in 1908, 190,114. (*New Zealand Yearbook*.) Mrs. K. A. Shepard, president of the New Zealand council of women, writes that in the elections of 1911, 221,858 women voted.

The majority of the women had never asked for suffrage in any of these places.

A GROWING CAUSE.

Opposition to woman suffrage is growing.—In Colorado, when woman suffrage was submitted the first time, it was defeated; the second time, it was carried by a majority of 6,387. In 1901, after the women had been voting for eight years, the matter was virtually resubmitted to the people and passed by a majority of 17,000.

In the State of Washington, the first time the majority against it was 19,386; the second time it was only 9,882, and it was finally carried in 1910 by a majority of 22,623.

In California, in 1895, the vote stood 110,355 for and 137,099 against, an adverse majority of 26,744. In 1911 the amendment carried by a majority of 3,587.

In 1913 three States of the Union gave suffrage to women, a larger number than ever did so in one year before. In 1913 Illinois and Alaska have followed suit, and in addition 12 State legislatures have given a majority vote of both houses in favor of submitting the question to the voters, three times as many as ever did so in a single year before.

THE TEST OF EXPERIMENT.

It works badly in practice.—Women have in this country now the full ballot in Wyoming, Idaho, Utah, Washington, California, Kansas, Oregon, Arizona, and

¹The Nonsense of It.

in the Territory of Alaska, while in Illinois they can vote for all municipal officers, some county and some State officers, and presidential electors. Abroad they have full parliamentary suffrage in New Zealand, Australia, Finland, Iceland, and Norway, while in the Isle of Man and in Bosnia women property owners can vote for members of the local parliament. They have municipal suffrage throughout England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, nine of the Provinces of Canada, Sweden, and Denmark. In some of these countries they have had it for generations.

In all these places put together the opponents thus far have not found a dozen respectable men who assert over their own names and addresses that it has had any bad results.

This is the more remarkable in view of the fact that active antisuffrage associations in New York and Massachusetts have been for years diligently gathering all the adverse testimony they could find.

On the other hand, scores of the most highly esteemed men and women in the equal suffrage States testify that the results are good.

In Wyoming women have had the full ballot for nearly half a century. For the last 25 years the advocates of equal suffrage have had a standing challenge, inviting its opponents to find, in all Wyoming, two respectable men who will assert over their own names and addresses that it has had any bad results whatever. The opponents have thus far failed to respond.

DOUBLING THE VOTE.

It would only double the vote without changing the result.—If letting women sing in church merely doubled the volume of sound, it would still be a good thing, because it would double the number of persons who had the lung exercise and the inspiration of joining in a good hymn and it would make the chorus stronger. If equal suffrage merely doubled the number of voters, it would still do good, because to take an interest in public affairs would give women mental stimulus and greater breadth of view; and it would also bring to bear on public problems the minds of an increased number of intelligent and patriotic citizens. But the great advantage of women in music is that they add the soprano and alto to the tenor and bass. If women were exactly like men, equal suffrage would merely double the vote. But women are different from men; and women's voices in the State, like women's voices in the choir, would be the introduction of a new element. This is recognized even by opponents, when they express the fear that equal suffrage would lead to "sentimental legislation."

Men are superior to women along certain lines, and women superior to men along certain others. The points of weakness in American politics at present are precisely the points where women are strong. There is no lack in our politics of business ability, executive talent, or "smartness" of any kind. There is a dangerous lack of conscience and humanity. The business interests, which appeal more especially to men, are well and shrewdly looked after; the moral and humanitarian interests, which appeal more especially to women, are apt to be neglected.

NOT A NATURAL RIGHT.

Suffrage is not a natural right.—It is hard to define just what a "natural right" is. Dr. James Freeman Clarke said: "If all women were forbidden to use the sidewalk, and they complained of the injustice, it would be no answer to tell them that it was not a natural or inherent right, but one given by society, and which society might therefore control as it saw fit. A great many rights are given by society of which, however, it would be manifestly unjust to deprive either sex."

TOO MANY VOTERS.

We have too many voters already.—This only means that we have too many voters of the wrong kind. If to increase the number of voters were an evil in itself, every woman who becomes the mother of half a dozen sons would have done harm to her country. But if all six grow up to be good voters, she has conferred a benefit on her country. So she has if five of them become good voters and only one a bad voter. Woman suffrage would bring in at least five good voters to one bad one.

It is often said that we have too many immigrants. We mean too many immigrants of an undesirable kind. We all rejoice when we hear of a large influx from Finland or some other country whose people are considered especially desirable immigrants. We want them to offset those of less virtuous and law-abiding races. The governor of one of the enfranchised States writes of woman suffrage: "The effect of this increase in the vote is the same as if a large and eminently respectable class of citizens had immigrated here."

WOULD UNSEX WOMEN.

It will turn women into men.—The differences between men and women are natural; they are not the result of disfranchisement. The fact that all men have equal rights before the law does not wipe out natural differences of character and temperament between man and man. Why should it wipe out the natural differences between men and women? The women of England, Scotland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, the Scandinavian countries, and our own equal suffrage States are not perceptibly different in looks or manners from women elsewhere, although they have been voting for years.

WOMEN DO NOT WANT IT.

Whenever the majority of women ask for suffrage they will get it.—Every improvement in the condition of women thus far has been secured not by a general demand from the majority of women, but by the arguments, entreaties, and "continual coming" of a persistent few. In each case the advocates of progress have had to contend not merely with the conservatism of men but with the indifference of women, and often with active opposition from some of them.

When a man in Saco, Me., first employed a saleswoman, the men boycotted his store, and the women remonstrated with him on the sin of placing a young woman in a position of such "publicity." When Lucy Stone began to try to secure for married women the right to their own property, women asked with scorn, "Do you think I would give myself where I would not give my property?" When Elizabeth Blackwell began to study medicine, women at her boarding house refused to speak to her, and women passing her on the street held their skirts aside. It is a matter of history with what ridicule and opposition Mary Lyon's first efforts for the education of women were received not only by the mass of men but by the mass of women as well.

In eastern countries, where women are shut up in zenanas and forbidden to walk the streets unveiled, the women themselves are often the strongest upholders of these traditional restrictions, which they have been taught to think add to their dignity. The Chinese lady is as proud of her small feet as any American antisuffragist is of her political disabilities. Pundita Ramabai tells us that the idea of education for girls is so unpopular with the majority of Hindu women that when a progressive Hindu proposes to educate his little daughter, it is not uncommon for the women of his family to threaten to drown themselves.

All this merely shows that human nature is conservative, and that it is fully as conservative in women as in men. The persons who take a strong interest in any reform are generally few, whether among men or women, and they are habitually regarded with disfavor, even by those whom the proposed reform is to benefit.

Many changes for the better have been made during the last half century in the laws, written and unwritten, relating to women. Everybody approves of these changes now, because they have become accomplished facts. But not one of them would have been made to this day, if it had been necessary to wait till the majority of women asked for it. The change now under discussion is to be judged on its merits. In the light of history, the indifference of most women and the opposition of a few must be taken as a matter of course. It has no more rational significance now than it has had in regard to each previous step of women's progress.

Mrs. McCulloch. Mr. Chairman, Miss Blackwell has given you some figures upon the number of women in favor of woman suffrage. The map which she has presented will give you some idea of the number of men. The States in clear white show where the majority

of men have given us the right to vote. The black spots on the State of Illinois show that the Illinois suffragists have not received full suffrage at those points, those spots meaning we can not vote for you Congressmen yet. In the State of Illinois our law has just recently gone into effect, and we have had a few State elections, probably a hundred or more in the State throughout the various counties, and whereas there has been a great deal of talk in the newspapers to the effect that the men are opposed to it and will test the constitutionality of our law, there have been only four counties among a hundred and two where any man was, in fact, in favor of making a test, and of those four counties in two of them the judges have decided that the law is constitutional, and that map stands for man's views on woman



WHITE STATES: Full Suffrage. SHADED STATES: Taxation, Bond or School Suffrage. DOTTED STATE: Presidential, Partial County and State, Municipal Suffrage. BLACK STATES: No Suffrage.

suffrage. It is appropriate at this time that we hear from the men of other States which have not given us the ballot, and Mr. James Leeds Laidlaw will be our next speaker.

STATEMENT OF MR. JAMES LEEDS LAIDLAW, OF NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. LAIDLAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as I listened to the opponents of our movement it was hard for me to realize that we are in the twentieth century. Many of the same arguments were used a hundred years ago when manhood suffrage was being considered.

History shows that in all ages there are many people who were opposed to all sorts of changes and who were timid or afraid to make any advance. Our friends the antisuffragists are timid and afraid to take the chance of making this change in this country. They do not seem to realize that the world is progressive, that civilization is progressive, and that different conditions in different centuries require different laws and require different government, perhaps.

It seems to me their attitude really amounts to a distrust of democracy. They have not faith that the people can govern themselves.

They also have a fear and distrust of Congress, according to all of the speeches this morning. They are afraid that this committee would appoint or Congress would appoint a packed committee, which would be composed entirely of suffragists and which would be unfair.

Gentlemen, I assure you that if you desire to recommend that this committee shall be elected we do not care whether the members of it are suffragists or antisuffragists. We rather hope they are anti-suffragists, because it would be all the more credit to us to win them over. The fact that the action of the Democratic Senate in appointing a committee, a majority of whose members are Democrats, to be known as a committee on woman suffrage, has never been attempted to be used as an implied indorsement of woman suffrage by the Democratic Party as a whole, seems to answer the contention of the opposition that the appointment of such a committee by the House would be so used.

All that people of unprejudiced minds require is to think for awhile on this subject and they will become favorable to it.

What does democracy mean? To my mind, and I think to the minds of most people, democracy means the right of the individual to join in the government. And why? It means that the individual should have the right to protect himself or herself in the law. Are not the women of this country entitled to as much right to protect themselves as men? Should not they have the right to protect their property, their children, and their honor just as men have now?

Mr. Chairman, the antisuffragists claim that there is not sufficient agitation or that a sufficient number of people do not want this committee appointed. It seems to me that the mere fact that the anti-suffragists as well as the suffrage people have come from all over this country, and have come in such numbers—it seems to me that that very fact indicates that this is a very important subject and that it is worthy a special committee to give it consideration.

There were a number of statements made here, but too many for us to refute in such a short time, but one was made yesterday which I should like to deny. An attempt has been made to show that the people of the suffrage States believe that suffrage in those States has been a failure. I do not believe that you would get more than half a dozen men of repute to make such a statement; but yesterday a young lady, I believe from Los Angeles, Cal., made a statement to the effect that Senator Works has stated in a speech in Los Angeles that woman suffrage in the State of California was a failure. It so happens that the same statement has been made in various parts of the country, and that Senator Works has denied it, and, fortunately, at the present time, he was within easy reach; and yesterday afternoon I called upon him and told him what had been said, and he wrote me a letter, which I have here and desire to read.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES,
Washington, December 4, 1913.

JAMES L. LAIDLAW, Esq.,
President Men's League for Woman's Suffrage.

MY DEAR MR. LAIDLAW: I did not make any statement in California or anywhere else that woman's suffrage in California has proved a failure. Such a news item was sent out over the Associated Press, but it was entirely without foundation, and was based upon a false headline in a newspaper not borne out by the quotation from my speech even in that paper.

You may say for me that the statement is wholly without foundation, and that woman's suffrage has not proved to be a failure in my State.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN D. WORKS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 8, 1913.

Hon. ROBERT L. HENRY,

Chairman of Committee on Rules, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HENRY: May I ask that you incorporate in the hearings on the question of suffrage for women this letter as explanatory of a previous letter submitted at the hearings, written by me to Mr. James L. Laidlaw, president of the Men's League for Woman's Suffrage. In that letter I denied a published statement attributing to me the view that woman's suffrage had proved a failure in California. This published statement gained wide circulation, and I was under the impression that it had been sent out by the Associated Press. I am now informed, however, that the Associated Press did not send out this statement, and I therefore wish to relieve that organization from any responsibility in the matter, at the same time repeating what was the main purpose of my letter to Mr. Laidlaw, that any published statement attributing to me the expression that woman's suffrage had proved a failure in California was absolutely groundless.

Thanking you for incorporating this in the record of your proceedings, I am

Yours, very truly,

(Signed)

JOHN D. WORKS.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the other statements are as misleading as this one was, and I have no doubt that many of them were, because, as we have said before, the attempt has been made over and over again by the antisuffragists to get the suffrage law repealed in those States without success, and we of the Men's League, the National Men's League for Woman's Suffrage, who has branches in most of the States of the country, and which has in my State of New York a membership of over 5,000, we believe this is an important question, and we voters ask you to give some attention to it, and respectfully ask that you report in favor of the election of this committee on woman suffrage.

Mrs. McCULLOCH. One of the men speakers was saying that the great respect felt for women in the male suffrage States would be lost when the women got the vote. In his remarks he referred to seeing numbers of women vote on school-suffrage matters in Massachusetts. If that is a sample of the respect in which women are held by men in male suffrage States, we would recommend him to go to the real suffrage States, where they speak of droves of cattle, and not of women. One poor, misguided girl, who said she was a working girl, said she was afraid she would lose respect if she asked for the ballot. I hope she will not lose respect. A majority of the working girls want the ballot, and they want this committee appointed, and I am going to ask Mrs. Winslow to read you a resolution which was adopted by the National Women's Trade Union League. She is a working girl, and she will read you a resolution passed by the National Women's Trade Union League at its national convention, and passed without a dissenting vote. She will read it, and it will go into our record as the feeling of the great body of working women who are organized.

STATEMENT OF MISS ROSE WINSLOW, OF NEW YORK CITY.

MISS WINSLOW. Now gentlemen, a woman here has said—and they all have simply quoted their own personal beliefs on this subject—has said that it was her personal belief that 75 or 80 per cent of the

working women, if asked, would be absolutely against getting the vote. So far as a personal opinion amounts to anything, I can give my personal experience and opinion to the contrary, because I have worked in the woolen mills, in the cotton mills, and I have been one of the millions of women who has helped to upbuild the industries about which our Congressmen talk so eloquently, and I never have had time or freedom to study any poetry so I could appreciate it, and I never have walked on Fifth Avenue, never having time in the daytime. I have not had any choice, as the gentleman very fitly said, as to whether I should walk on the Bowery or on Fifth Avenue, because I walked nowhere in the sunshine. I am one of the millions of women who work in the shadow of these women, of whom men speak as though they are the only women in the country, that these women may parade the Avenue in all the beauty and glory of everything brought from all over the world for their decoration. I have had nothing, my friends on this committee, of that beauty. Not only have we had no roses, but we have had not even bread; and I think that so far as a personal opinion amounts to anything that my opinion is just as valuable and just as worthy of being heard as are these other opinions from the working women. But you know that I do not come with merely my personal opinion and my personal experience. I have the opinion of the organized working women of America in convention assembled. These women represent all the trades that women work in in the United States, and they have decided unanimously and passed this resolution without a single dissenting vote, and they ought to know whether they need it or not.

One of the antisuffragist speakers said that the thing for the working women was not the ballot, but that their redemption was in unions and the formation of unions, and in that way they could fill their lives and get better wages. Well, this is the opinion of the organized trade movement in America.

Mrs. McCULLOCH. Our next speaker will be Mrs. Emma S. South, of Chicago, the wife of former Representative Oliver South. She says she has sat by his side many a day in the representative halls, and she claims also that she has advised him sometimes about legislation. She was our last year's chairman of the Mississippi Valley Conference, composed of the representatives of 20 States—the Mississippi Valley Suffrage Conference. She is well acquainted with the conditions in the Middle West and may well be able to answer some of your questions.

STATEMENT OF MRS. EMMA S. SOUTH, OF CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if there has been any doubt in the minds of your committeemen or others as to the advisability of having a special committee at this time to investigate the claims of the suffragists and the allegations of the anti-suffragists, to go into the history of the work of suffrage where it now exists, it seems to me that what has taken place in the past three days would prove to every committeeman and everyone else interested the necessity of having such a special committee. The suffragists took two hours on the first day to present their argument, not on the general phase of equal suffrage, but as to the advisability of the appointment of this special committee. All day yesterday and

this morning the opponents of equal suffrage have spoken. They have adduced alleged facts and statements which would require weeks of investigation, it seems to me, to verify, if it were possible to verify those statements. I wish to call the attention of the committee to the statement—to the testimony offered at the time of the hearing of the suffragettes by Mrs. Catt and others as to the tremendous interest in this movement now, not only in America, but throughout the civilized world. She told you of the convention at Budapest during the summer, where delegates from 26 nations came, 2,800 in number, speaking 22 languages, these countries having national woman-suffrage associations such as the association meeting in this city at this time. She told you that in a majority of all the parliaments of the civilized world within the past year that this question had been a subject of parliamentary discussion, showing that this is not at all an isolated and sporadic movement to-day; it is not a piece of freak legislation on the part of the suffrage States in the United States that have enacted these laws. It is a great world movement to-day. It is one of the most significant, one of the most far-reaching of all the movements of this wonderful dynamic age. There is to-day a tremendous history of the working of woman suffrage. As Sydney Lanier has said, it is idle to argue from prophecy when you can argue from history.

Now, I submit to you, gentlemen, that the argument to which you listened yesterday and this morning was largely an argument of prophecy and an argument of prophecy, of disaster, of distress; a prophecy of evil; and I may say, in passing, that one who observed the presentation of the two sides might conclude that this whole matter is a division on lines of temperament, for the suffragists are buoyed up and make their claims for the enfranchisement of women because they have hope, because they believe in women. They have the positive characteristics of trust; that trust which has been justified by the extension of leagues and educational and social liberty to women. Every door of advancement which has been opened to women has justified the faith of those who carried on the strenuous reforms up to the time when these doors might be opened, that all women might profit by it. On the other hand, the opponents of equal suffrage have brought to you their ancient fears; their prejudices; their prophecies that the very foundations of the homes and of civilizations would be demolished if this very democratic principle were established. One might go on with that line of argument forever and we would get nowhere.

An ancient philosopher proved by logic which would probably be very difficult for any of us to disprove, I presume, that there could be no such thing as motion, yet an infant may throw its tiny arm; an insect may flutter its delicate wing; and the fact of motion is proved and can not be gainsaid. We have had in this country, since 1869, the working of suffrage in one State; in another since 1893; in two others since 1890; and in Australia since 1895 and 1896. This is no longer an academic question, but there is such vast literature to-day of statistics, of history, that it seems to me that a committee that is burdened with other great questions will not have sufficient time to go into this question, to study the facts that can be brought and that can be authenticated, and to sift these various allegations

against the working of suffrage, but that a special committee should be appointed now that would take up a question which has assumed such tremendous proportions as this and upon which there is so much to be said.

So I trust that this special committee may be appointed; a committee that will study this question and will make a report so that Congress may discuss this question, and that this country may eventually take its part along with other civilized countries in the free and honest discussion of both sides of the question. A point was made yesterday by one of the speakers that where women have school suffrage they do not use it. He said that in Massachusetts few women used the school suffrage, and the other speakers mentioned this point also. It is a very well-known fact that in Colorado the women had school suffrage before they were given equal suffrage, and the vote upon school matters was about as in other States where women have the vote; and I may say that the proportion of women is usually about as large as the proportion of men who go to the school elections. But in Illinois, by our latest suffrage victory, we have had additional power given to the women in school matters, and already we see that the larger the power that it conferred the greater the interest. For instance, we are now allowed to vote upon questions of taxation with reference to schools. Before this time we could vote only for the local trustee, and you may be interested to know that the very first election which took place in Illinois after our new bill became a law on the 1st day of July, on the 2d day of July in a country school district in a central Illinois county a special election had been scheduled to vote upon the question of building a new schoolhouse, and on this first day of their enfranchisement the farmer women went to the polls in greater numbers than the men of that district, and while the votes of the men were against the proposition of a new school building the votes of the women were sufficient to carry it. And in the perhaps 35 or 40 elections which have been held in our State since this bill became a law, although in most of those places we have done nothing in the way of suffrage work—that is, we knew of no suffrage workers—we might well have been a little bit afraid of the result of the election coming in from a place where no notice of special election had gone forth. But we need not have had any fears, for those women in every case knew themselves and knew their duty, and the records have shown that as large a number of women as of men have voted in those elections, and in some cases a greater number of women have voted.

I wish to speak to you on just one point that the antisuffragists urge, that one of their fears is that women will lose their indirect influence when they gain direct power. Now the suffragists have always contended that this could not be true, because among men some men have more indirect influence than other men; because that indirect influence always depends upon such qualities as education, as social position, as wealth, or something of that sort. But, as among men, it has been the salvation of democracy that every man, however insignificant or down trodden he may be, at least on election day has had the same power of protection as his more influential brother. And women also have recognized their indirect influence with government, and in Chicago one of our aldermen says that he gave credit to the women for every single good thing he had in that city along

the line of moral advancement, and had found that every single thing we have, such as juvenile courts, small parks and playgrounds, and all such utilitarian efforts, had been, without a single exception, by reason of women's efforts. But the Chicago women, like other women, have found that it has always taken the maximum in influence for the minimum of result.

While the Chicago women have not yet cast a vote for mayor and aldermen, during this summer we have had presented to us a concrete example of the fact that our stock in Chicago has suddenly taken a rise. Just a week after election, for instance, we were cordially invited by our election commissioners to come down to the city hall. A special day had been set aside, and officials would be on hand to receive the new women voters to exhibit and explain to us the voting machines, which we would operate, and explain the naturalization laws and the registration and election laws; and the next week they went a step farther in their chivalry and appointed nine women on salary to go around to all the women's clubs and instruct the women voters in these questions of interest to them.

During the summer we feared for a while that we would lose the superintendent of our public board of instruction, Mrs. Ella Flag Young, one of the greatest educators in America; a woman who had brought order out of chaos in our school situation in that city; one who had the respect of the teaching force and of the general public. The Chicago school board is appointed by the mayor, an exception to the school law in our State, and for some time political appointments have been made on the school board. Mrs. Young was feeling handicapped in carrying out her splendid educational policies, and it at last came to the point when she felt that in order to maintain her self-respect she must either resign this work or have the power to do the work which she felt was necessary for the Chicago schools. So Chicago was shocked one morning to find a record of the resignation of Mrs. Young. At 11 o'clock that day there were about 15 women gathered in the Women's Civic Club in Chicago. Each of these women represented a strong organization of women. They decided something must be done quickly, and that, being familiar with two lines of work, they decided they had better start a letter campaign (for Illinois women have certainly bought postage stamps during the past number of years), and they decided that each organization should be asked to write letters to the mayor, requesting him to use his influence with the board and with the members of the school board. And, then, because we have always had great public meetings to educate the people and to give matter to the press, we decided that we must have a great citizens' protest mass meeting, and Orchestra Hall was engaged for the evening for the latter part of the week. The rental of Orchestra Hall is \$300, and we supposed we would have to spend another \$150 or \$200 to properly advertise the meeting.

To make a long story short, we did not have to have the great citizens' protest mass meeting; we saved our \$500 right there. The mayor has never told how many thousands of letters he received, but every one of those letters which he received was written by a woman who is going to have a vote for the next mayor of Chicago; and it was perfectly wonderful how quickly our mayor got into action; and

by Saturday morning there was a letter from the mayor to Mrs. Young, published in every Chicago paper, in which he expressed his desire that she would give her distinguished services to Chicago as long as she felt able, and saying he would bear this in mind when he appointed the five new members which were then up for appointment, and he did. He reappointed three men who had stood by Mrs. Young's policies and two splendid Chicago women, and the school board met that afternoon and, with just one dissenting vote, they rejected the resignation of Mrs. Young. And I can assure you that Chicago women rubbed their eyes and realized that however strong indirect influence might be, that it apparently had been doubled and trebled by the fact that behind that indirect power was something now that politicians respect.

Mrs. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, we will next hear from the president of the Alabama Women's Suffrage Association. She is also secretary of the Mississippi Valley Conference, showing that the North and the South can unite on these things quite frequently. Gentlemen, I introduce Mrs. Patty R. Jacobs.

STATEMENT OF MRS. PATTY R. JACOBS.

Mrs. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, it gives me especial pleasure to have this opportunity to refute the statement that used to be made in the Halls of Congress that the southern womanhood did not want the ballot. That statement used to be made, but it is now acknowledged by some of our Congressmen that we do want the ballot, but that we are misguided. Either view is an indictment of the southern women's intelligence, which I resent, although I am not supposed to be of the chivalrous sex.

I am a southern woman; I was born there, reared there, educated there, lived there, and have children who live there; and I assure you that we southern women are very tired of being considered different from other women. We are not angels, we are not lilies, we are not roses, we are not even moons, but we are just human beings. Now, as human beings, we are organized in the States of Louisiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Alabama, and, in fact, in all but one of the Southern States; and I believe I have voiced the sentiment of all the organized suffragists in these States when I say that we would like to see this committee appointed. If four-fifths of the House of Representatives are against suffrage, as has been said by the Alabama Congressman, why is he afraid to have this committee appointed? I ask, therefore, that justice be done to the women of America by the appointment of this committee, and I hold that the remarks of the Alabama Congressman are irrelevant.

Mrs. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, it seems impossible to stop the cheering, but we will endeavor to do so if you say we must.

Our next speaker will be the president of the Ohio Women's Suffrage Association, elected to that position by the votes of women. She also happens to be the president of the school board of her own town, Warren, elected by the votes of men and women. Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton, whose father was a former Congressman. She lived here when a little girl; perhaps, before your time, gentlemen.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON.

Mrs. Upton. I should like to correct the chairman. I never was little. Mr. Chairman, I occupy rather a unique position. When I came into the hall to-day I heard a gentleman talking something about letting the scales drop from your eyes. I do not know whether that was the same man who was talking about the sons of Eli or not, I did not quite understand, but I want to say one thing, that I am a living example of having the scales dropped from my eyes, because I am a reformed antisuffragist. I am one of the converted, and so the scales have dropped from my eyes, but, you see, they were a different kind of scales, and I am so glad they dropped.

I should like to make the kind of speech I heard here this morning. That is the kind I can make—a speech from the Bible. I have a Bible class myself almost as large as this audience, and I could make a better speech from the Bible, but I am not allowed to do that.

I want to tell you just something to refute one or two statements that were made here yesterday, but before I do that I want to tell you that I am unique in another way, and that is that I still retain a little bit of my antisuffrage feeling, because when I was elected to the school board I gladly accepted. And that is true, I am told by Miss Blackwell—Miss Blackwell is one suffragist who never has told a lie—that when women who are antisuffragists are elected to school boards they accept gracefully.

I was brought up, as Mrs. McCulloch ought to have told you, in the Judiciary Committee of the House. That happened because my father—my mother died early—and my father was elected to Congress, and I came here with him, and many and many are the days I sat with him in the Judiciary Committee, and one day I was sitting there and there was nothing to read, so I picked up a book that did not look very entertaining, and I saw it was the Rules of the House of Representatives; and then I turned it over to see what was in it, and in that book I found the duties of the chairmen of committees, and I drew a little nearer to the window and I opened that book and I read what a long, long list were the duties of the Committee of the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and I said to my father, "Why, father, here are 16 or 18 duties of the Judiciary Committee," and I said, "Can you discharge those duties?" Now, you know boys often yarn to their mothers, do they not, and we are told that husbands often tell wives things which are not true; but when a man is older and he has upon himself the entire responsibility of his little girl he does not very often lie to her. So my father looked very serious, and he said, when I asked him the question, "Father, can you attend to all these duties and do them well?" he looked very serious, and he told me the truth, for he said, "We can not." And so I thought I would like to copy those rules out of that book of the Rules of the House of Representatives and see what the duties of the Judiciary Committee are. I am not going to read you what they are, but of the direct duties, if I count correctly, there are 21 distinct duties that belong to that committee, besides some which are not wholly theirs.

And now, gentlemen, it seems to me that a committee of judges—you know how slow judges are—that a committee of judges having

under their jurisdiction 21 serious questions to consider all the time would never have the time to consider a question which was not serious, that is the question of woman suffrage, and consequently we beg of you to allow us to have a committee of our own, because the Committee on the Judiciary would not have time to attend to our matter.

I wish to refute such statements that I understand were made here yesterday, I think two by Ohio women. One Ohio woman said that the Ohio Woman's Suffrage Association was about to withdraw its initiative petition because we saw we were not going to be able to get the signatures. I helped to frame that initiative petition; I am circulating that initiative petition; I have never had a thought of withdrawing it, nor has anyone of my colleagues on the committee. So that simply was a misstatement by Miss Price, if it was Miss Price; she must have misunderstood about it. Then somebody said there were 97 per cent of the women of the State of Ohio who did not want the vote. Nobody under the sun knows how many women in the State of Ohio want to vote, but we know some of them, and I have a record in my own office of women who have either by enrollment or indorsement subscribed to woman suffrage, who say they are suffragists, and that record, although it has not been made up for some months, contains 215,000 names. There is no 97 per cent in that. And then, if, as our opponents state, every woman influences a man, then of course there has to be one woman to influence each man, does there not? That is just as easy as the first part of arithmetic. The last part is hard, but the first part is easy.

Now, then, if it takes one woman to influence one man to vote, if we have 215,000 women who say they want to vote, over their own names, and 249,000 men who at the ballot box said so, have we not, as it appears, a half million women in the State of Ohio who have declared directly—according to our methods indirectly, but according to their methods directly, for woman suffrage?

Mrs. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, our next speaker is Mrs. Crozier French, of Tennessee.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CROZIER FRENCH.

Mrs. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we are especially glad, I think, to hear once in a while from the southern women, to refute what is so often said about her, and which Mrs. Jacobs, of Alabama, has spoken, too, that many southern women can think as well as the women of the North and the West. We are not entirely parasitic, nor without our own opinions and views of things. In reference to the gentleman who gave us such an eloquent description of the moon and the sun, I wish to call his attention to the fact that his metaphor was what he wants the moon and the sun to be, but the astronomers tell us that the moon is a dead planet.

We women suffragists acknowledge that women in this Government have apparently been fair, but we do not acknowledge that they are as much so as some men would like for them to be, and only to shine by reflected light.

I wish first to voice the sentiments of the people of Tennessee and give you my reason for thinking that the people of Tennessee want the fullest investigation of this subject. I am going to give you a practical reason for that, and not my opinion. In November, Knoxville had an exposition and an antisuffragist, who was a native of Tennessee, but who had been living in Washington and Tennessee for 15 years, Mrs. Anna Riley Hale, wrote and asked the exposition company if she might give an antisuffrage address in the exposition grounds, and they wrote her that she could, provided she would allow Mrs. French to answer her. She consented. Now that shows you the position of the managers of the exposition, that they did not wish to hear one side, but they did want to hear both sides. She came, and the largest audience, except the one that saw Helen Keller, greeted the debaters on the night of the debate—the largest audience that was there, some 4,000 people. That shows you the interest in Tennessee in equal suffrage. It was not that they were advocating or encouraging the antisuffragist, because she stayed there a week, and while she was a native of east Tennessee and knew many people in Knoxville, and used her influence and went around and electioneered and advertised in the papers to organize an antisuffrage league, she was able to get a meeting of but 21 people, 6 of whom were members of the equal suffrage league of Knoxville, and went there to watch the proceedings. She could not organize a local league at all. No woman would be the president of an antisuffrage league in Knoxville, and she scoured that city. She then went to Chattanooga to try to do the same thing, and I was told by a Chattanooga lady that she had 15 people in her audience. I do not know how many were suffragists.

(A voice from the audience: Nine.)

Mrs. FRENCH. Nine suffragists of the 15. She did not organize there. That, gentlemen, shows you conclusively that the people of the South—of my State—want to hear this question discussed.

I wish to speak of only one point that was made here yesterday. A gentleman expressed amazement that the woman suffragists at the convention passed a resolution in which they conveyed the idea that they thought the subject of woman suffrage was now the most important subject before the people of the United States, or the world. He was amazed at that, and I saw his amazement reflected in the faces of other gentlemen that stayed in the audience; that these women should think that the subject of their enfranchisement should take precedence of the currency question was a matter of amazement. Now, gentlemen, that is why we want women to have the vote, because many men think that their business can always come before the women's business. As to the currency and the tariff, we all acknowledge that men are the leaders in that sort of business, but women are supposed to be the protectors of, and responsible for, the home, and we believe that the women's business in protecting her home is of first importance; that nothing is more so. We are told also that sentimental conditions surround the women and the home, but we suffragists are practicable, and we believe the home comes first in practical questions, and we wish to be given the practical power—we have had sentimental stuff all the ages.

Now, we want the practical power to really protect that home, and that every man shall think that the home and woman's business is

just as important as the currency and the tariff. There is another reason. Why should the men want to hurry and get through with these important and epoch-making questions of the tariff and the currency before they have given the women the right to say what we want done with the currency and the tariff? Our money is involved as well as yours. We work to make this country as well as you, and we ought to have the right to vote before you go on in making legislation on these important points.

Mrs. McCULLOCH. Our next speaker will be Mrs. William Kent, wife of Congressman Kent, of California. They are both strong suffragists. You probably know her.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM KENT.

Mrs. KENT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when the California women were asking for the vote, they were actuated primarily by a very simple, a very feminine, and a very laudable desire to be better mothers and better housekeepers than they could possibly be without it. In California there has been a very discreditable record of a great many dependent children within the State. The women of California realized that they could not be mothers worthy of the name if they did not consider these children as well as the children within their own doors. They also realized that they could not care for their own children within their own doors without considering all these great problems in which our community life consists.

I have been obliged to be in Washington for the most part of the time since this thing was voted on in California—the vote that was won two years ago—and I know you want to hear what the women have been doing with it. In a way that is beside the point, because you do not ask the boy of 21 what he is going to do with his vote, and it is a question really of simple justice to us to give us a voice in the things that concern us just as much as it is justice to accord them the vote. But I understand the antisuffragists have been making charges as to what the California women, and the western women in general, have done or have not done with this vote, so I am going to give my time, if I may, to Miss Helen Todd, who has been in California the last two years for the most part and who has been making the most serious study of what women have done and are doing with this wonderful ballot.

STATEMENT OF MISS HELEN TODD, OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my conversion to suffrage came through six years of work as factory inspector in Illinois. I have always thought that the reason there could be such a thing as a woman who was an anti was simply that the screen of ignorance and the comfort of home and the protection of home was so thrown around them that they have never had to face the reality. I do not believe there is any woman in the world who, if she could see children toiling as I have seen them, if she could see women driven on the streets to earn their bread because they could not earn enough by honest toil to keep body and soul together, if she could see men, good men, weep as I have seen them weep because in this great mass

of the unemployed they could not get work and their families were going down into that frightful abyss, which is not just starvation, but which means filth and wretchedness and degradation; if you could tear the veil of agony of men and of women and of children and let those women look at it once, we would never have to make another speech in America to those women. It is because they do not understand. No one can go, as I have gone through the factories of a great State, and see the agony just of the children and not want the women, who create human life, to have the power to protect that life which they have created.

And so if I talked to you and told you about the legislation, that wonderful record which we have made in California—our extension of our lines, our motherhood pension, our protection of our children—you have heard it all, read it all, and you must know these things. Even though a few antis come back from there and malign us, there is the record of our State; we have the proofs. So it is not detail I want to talk to you about; I just want to say the one thing that seems to me to be the foundation for our great feeling for suffrage, and that is this: That the women go down to the gates of death to create human life, and when they stretch out their hands and say "Give me the ballot, that I may protect these children that are so dear to me, because I have suffered to create them," and the men go into those booths and vote "no," there is something wrong with the men. But the western man will not do it if he understands, and the eastern man will not do it if he understands. And so our vote was given to us in California. There were only three kinds of people that voted against us. There were the very rich, the men who consider women as ornaments, too good and too fine for such a task. You have heard so much about our delicate fibers. Why, if we had the gentleman from Alabama to campaign for us in the West we would never have to make a campaign ourselves; all the western men would vote for us. And I want to say now that the antis have helped us in California, because they sent women out there to tell our California men what a horrible thing it would be when their wives and sisters and mothers voted.

Mr. LENROOT. Did I understand you to say that you had been the factory inspector in Illinois for six years and then went out to California to a State position?

Miss TODD. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENROOT. Do you believe that the ballot is the best protection against the sweatshop?

Miss TODD. I do. We stand at the foot of all civilized nations in our destruction of child life. There is no nation that has the child-labor conditions which we have. There is no nation which stands as low in this statistics. We stand at the foot of all nations in our child-labor conditions, and I do believe that if women had the vote that they would change it; that they would wipe that stain of child labor off of America. As it is now, we passed a law in our State, and that State has to compete with child labor in other States, but if the women could vote in every State, wherever they had the vote we would have, as we now have where they can vote, better child-labor conditions. As I started to say, in California there were three types of men who voted against us; the very wealthy, who regard women

as ornaments, and as too fine and too beautiful to face the realities of life; the illiterate men joined hands with the wealthy men and voted no. I watched at the polls in California, and men who were digging a ditch, just men who were, a great many of them, ineligible yet to vote, who had not gotten out their naturalization papers, and we had the right, as they came up, to ask them if they would vote for our suffrage amendment. The first man I asked said this: "I cannot read and I cannot write, so I cannot vote. Next year I read—next year I learn to write, then I vote no." I said, "Why do you want to do that? We are willing to give you all we have. Why will you not have at least what we are willing to give you?" And he said that he had to do it, because God had not given women any sense. And all that day the illiterate, foreign population voted no. We got one vote out of that whole district, and that was a barber who lived across the way, and he said his assistant had run away with his wife, and he was going to vote yes so we could stop all those "monkey shines."

And on Pacific Avenue, where the rich live, they voted no; and down from our lumber camps and from our farms and from our mines and from our outlying districts outside of the city came the vote of the average man, the kind of man that when I campaigned through there I would say, "Will you vote for a suffrage amendment?" He would say, "Sure, I will. You know the grasshoppers ate up all our crops in Kansas, and my father had to come out here. He had no money and bought a little farm, and my mother just worked like a slave and pulled us through, and now the mortgage is paid off and we are all right. And if that woman ain't good enough to vote in this State show me a man that is." And another man would tell us about his daughter—how she taught school and had this education which he had not and could not get—and he said, "If she is not good enough to vote, where is the man who is good enough?" And that, gentlemen, is the feeling of the western men, that the women who have helped to build up the West are his equals and companions; not this fulsome flattery that was given us to-day, but that she is his comrade, his equal. We do not pretend to be better than men; we pretend to be their comrades and equals.

I am speaking before this committee representing largely the voting women of the West. We have a national federation of voting women amounting to almost 4,000,000 voters. My plea before this committee is this, that whenever the foreigner, this man who voted no because he could not read and write, but he was determined to vote no, anyway, as soon as he could, he has his representation; he has his chance. If there is anything the matter with the hogs or with the cattle, or anything goes wrong, there is a committee appointed to investigate it. We have now almost 4,000,000 women voting, representing this power, and we feel that as your constituents—not as pleaders, not as people who are here to show how good we are and how nicely we will behave, but as your constituents, voting people—that we have a right to ask you that a committee be appointed to consider this great question of the rights of women.

Mrs. McCULLOCH. We shall be glad to hear from another woman from Alabama, Mrs. Felix Baldrich.

STATEMENT OF MRS. FELIX BALDRICH, OF ALABAMA.

Mrs. BALDRICH. Gentlemen of the committee, ladies and gentlemen and antis, I feel at a great disadvantage because I am not one of those mannish women about whom our Representative talked so much this morning. If he means by mannish women, a woman who has been trained in public speaking or other spheres of usefulness outside of the home, I am not one, because I have never spoken in public before; I come straight from home to speak of the women of home, and to state that the women of Alabama wish the ballot to protect the home. I wish to tell the gentleman from Alabama, who represents a fraction of the men of Alabama and misrepresents all the women, I was given to understand that we would confine ourselves to the subject of an appeal to the committee, or rather a debate before the committee, as to the expediency of appointing another committee for the discussion of this question of woman suffrage, but since we have ranged all the way from women in the home to the moon, I am going to claim the privilege myself of ranging a bit with the others. I see that the gentleman from Alabama goes to the Bible for his argument. I should like to remind the gentleman from Alabama that Shakespeare, who knows a great deal more than I and a little bit more than does Mr. Heflin, that Shakespeare has said that the devil can go to Scripture to prove his purposes. He has said that universal suffrage would cause division in the home. I am speaking of facts. I am both a wife and a mother, and my men people do not represent me. We differ, but most agreeably, on political subjects, and I am proud of the fact that the men of my family can not be influenced or biased in anyway in regard to their votes. He has said, "By their fruits you shall know them," speaking of woman suffrage. I say, "By their fruits you shall know them," in speaking of men suffrage. In the heart of this civilization of ours, as brilliant as it is, there are crying needs for legislation; legislation for the conservation of human life. In regard to this who is better prepared or better fitted to concern themselves with such legislation than the mothers of the Nation?

Mrs. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, we will hear next from Mrs. John Rogers, jr., of New York.

STATEMENT OF MRS. JOHN ROGERS, JR., OF NEW YORK CITY.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have not had the pleasure, or perhaps I might say the weariness of listening to any of the hearing, so I can not venture to refute any special points that have been brought out. I am just going to tell you the way I feel about certain points. I know you have had plenty of facts, so this will be just feelings. I want to say one thing about indirect influence, about which we have heard so much. What in the world is the use of talking about it, because this question is a question of direct political influence, not at all of indirect influence. Gentlemen, you have indirect influence, of course, and so have women voters. It is a question of influence on legislation and executives; not indirect influence or direct influence, but it is political power. It is a question which is quite easily settled if you gentlemen

will kindly imagine that you put the shoe on the other foot. Suppose we had the vote and you did not, and suppose we said to you, "We honor you, we trust you, we love you, we want to do you all justice—just tell us what you want and it shall be done—if we think best." What would you say? What would you say? Would you be satisfied? I ask you honestly to put yourselves in our place. "No! no matter how much you loved us, or respected us, or honored us," you would say, "you can not speak for us, ladies. We must speak for ourselves." And another point is that indirect influence on legislation is the only weapon women can use on officials. What we desire, gentlemen, is that our legislators and executives and officials shall be obligated to think of the desires and wishes of the common, ordinary women—of the common, ordinary wife and mother—she who has not time to use this indirect influence upon legislation, but she has time to use the quick, direct method of the ballot. It is not enough that our legislators and officials should think of women's needs and desires, when especially distinguished women make them. We want them to be obligated to think of those needs all the time, because they are responsible to women voters.

Then, let me say a word about protection and chivalry, and that I may not be misunderstood, do let me say that there is no one who speaks of and honors and admires men for their splendid qualities more than I do; but is it not strange that they can really, honestly think that men as a race have protected women as a race? Is it not true that, as a race, they have exploited us in industry, and exploited us in prostitution? Let me present to you one terrible fact as a reason of our desire to protect ourselves, and I know there is not a mother here that will deny it. Why is it, gentlemen, that when our little daughters grow old enough and vigorous enough to desire to go to school alone without a nurse; to desire to roam in the country freely, when that natural independence comes to them—and it does—and why is it that we have to curb it, which is not good for the mothers of the future race? And we have to tell them: "No; you can not go to school alone. No; you can not do this, when you would feel like doing it, and it would make you stronger and more intelligent." Is it because we are afraid they will be run over by automobiles? No. They are intelligent enough to look out for that. Is it because we are afraid of diseases lurking about? No; that is a risk they have to take, even with their nurses along, and we can guard them against that. What is it? I put it right to you straight from the shoulder; what is it? What is that reason? It is just in one word, what we are afraid of for them and must guard them from forever, it is men. Let me add, we are not blaming the men, but we are saying: "Give us, whose duty it is to shelter and protect, the power to choose those who shall govern us, because they make the conditions greatly under which we must bring up our children."

Let me also bring up one more point in begging you not to believe what our opponents have said, for one great reason, and I do not know whether it has come to you as you have heard them talk, but I believe I am telling the truth when I say that those women, even the best of them, do not believe in democracy; that if you would question them, you would find they do not believe in universal suffrage for men. I have questioned them closely and I find that there

is that snake's head of disbelief in democracy showing always, and I ask you, gentlemen, whether women who do not believe in the fundamental principles for which we stand in this country are worthy of being believed about this great movement, and they are not even worthy if they do not believe in universal suffrage; they are not even worthy of being the mothers of American citizens.

I will close by saying that to me the vote is a symbol of liberty and it is a safeguard of the liberties that are symbolized and it is an instrument that should be in the hands of the women of the United States. And, gentlemen, I beg of you to appoint the woman suffrage committee. You know we are going to win; you know this thing is coming, and you might just as well appoint the committee and swim with the tide.

Mrs. McCULLOCH. We now have several three-minute speakers, of whom Mrs. Catherine J. Wester, of Tennessee, is the first.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CATHERINE J. WESTER, OF CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Rules Committee: It is not to my disadvantage that I was absent from this morning's hearing, for I realize how very little which is new can be said against woman suffrage. However, there are two statements said to have been made by the antis, which I am very anxious to emphatically deny.

First, that southern women do not want the ballot. They do. I speak as a representative of the organized suffragists of Tennessee, and can assure you that we Tennessee women want the vote. Second, that suffrage for women primarily aims to destroy the home.

It is to preserve the home that the true suffragist seeks. She is not going out into politics. Politics is coming home to her. She finds politics wielding a mighty influence in the education of her child, in the cleaning of her streets, in the collection of her garbage, even in the cleanliness of the milk left at the kitchen door; she finds that politics means the regulation of saloons, picture shows, and the moral conditions of the community, all of which affect the home through the fathers, sons, and brothers, and, too, often the daughters.

"Already we have substantial proofs of the weakening of the domestic ties in those States where suffrage has longest been used by women * * *" is the statement made by your editorial. Do you give as one of these proofs that New Zealand, the country in which women have had the ballot for nearly 30 years, is called "the land without a brothel?" Do you incorporate in your list the fact that the red light districts of Chico, Red Bluff, and Oroville, all California towns, have been closed by order of the authorities? Did you consider that the English birth rate is declining to such an extent that the national council of public morals has appointed a commission to investigate, while New Zealand proudly proclaims a birth rate of rising proportions? Did you remember Seattle and how the women voters there defeated Mayor Gill and the building of a "crib house" for the detention of 80 white slaves? Have you looked up the score made by California in supplying her school children with free books? Did you note that our American, the Rev. Charles Scadding, bishop of Oregon, attributes the bringing about of Portland's efficient commission government largely to the vote of the women?

Sometimes the best way of telling what a thing is is to tell what it isn't. Very often the plainer and more comprehensive manner of explaining a thing is to show a list of its opponents. Incensed because the new women voters cast "dry" ballots at the recent Illinois elections, liquor dealers in five towns have announced that they will contest the elections, claiming that the men alone voted "wet," and that the women had no right to vote on the liquor question. In the last Michigan campaign the tables in brothels, gambling dens, and liquor saloons were piled high with antisuffrage literature free, with invitations to patrons to distribute. The white-slave traffickers are bitterly opposed to votes for women. The oppressive trusts, grinding away the lives of child workers, will fight the issue. The antis were on the side of those ribald, indecent men and boys who climbed upon floats and insulted respected women and girls in the Washington parade at President Wilson's inauguration. Men who oppose a minimum working wage for women and girls, who oppose more reasonable working hours and more healthful conditions under which they must work, are also opposed to woman suffrage. And here you would bring up before me, as you state, "the antisentiment of women themselves." Of the 8,000,000 working women in the United States, those opposed to suffrage are so because of ignorance of their own conditions. Very few working women will refuse the ballot when they learn what it means. Of the millions of intelligent women, striving through clubs and various civic organizations to accomplish reforms, those opposed to suffrage are opposed because of ignorance of the value of the ballot; in other words, they have not "forgotten themselves" long enough to be suffragists—long enough to think of other women.

The man who wants his wife to understand "that the washtub and the cookstove are the sole aims of her existence" is neither a suffragist nor an anti; he is an impossible cad; and the man who says that "the home must be destroyed" is just a little bit worse than the man who says that such is the doctrine of the suffragists; and both are equal to the first.

We have within our organizations in Tennessee young women who are keeping together by their daily labors families that would otherwise become "destroyed." We have women who are keeping together families of which men are yet the heads. We have women who have seen their families grow up, marry, and leave them empty handed, but who are still of that "uplifting" tendency which calls them to think of other women beside themselves. We have women who can "either wash, cook, set a table, or serve a meal," and not one who says, "The home must be destroyed."

We want this Rules Committee, whose business it is to represent the people, to give us a square deal. We do not ask you to commit yourselves to woman suffrage, but we do ask that you allow the subject to come before the House that we may know just how many and which of our Representatives do believe in the preservation of the rights of half the people of the United States.

Let me here quote the distinguished Dr. Stephen S. Wise: "I am ashamed of those women opposed to woman suffrage, who fly from one bridge table to another, and at the same time say that a woman

who goes out into the world and takes part in making humanity better destroys the home. I say that a woman who does this brings back to her home much more than she takes away from it."

Unlike the gentleman from Alabama—speaking of this representative of the "people," I marvel at the fact that this man's physical magnitude has so far outgrown his sense of justice—unlike Mr. Heflin, who forgot in his morning's flight that the Goddess of Liberty stands firmly upon earth, and who attempted to carry her with him in his sweep through the blue zenith of wishy-washy oratory, I shall speak directly to the point and appeal to this Committee upon Rules to vote in favor of giving us a special committee of the House to consider this all-important question. I thank you.

ARGUMENT OF MRS. F. W. MONDELL, OF WYOMING, FOR A COMMITTEE ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Gentlemen, I wish to thank you for this opportunity of presenting briefly a few of the many excellent reasons why, in my opinion, the creation of a Committee on Woman Suffrage would be in harmony and in accordance with the usual and orderly practice of the House of Representatives. Selected as your committee is, by reason of the familiarity of its members with the rules and practices of the House, I have not the slightest thought that I can add anything to your information on the subject of the practice of that honorable body in the matter of establishing committees. My thought is to appeal to you to take such action in the matter we present to you as harmonizes with the practice and custom of the House with regard to subjects and questions of importance.

The House of Representatives had, I believe, in the last Congress, 55 committees, to which has been added, I understand, a Committee on Roads. Many of these committees have a jurisdiction of wide extent and great importance, but I think that no one who is informed on the subject would suggest that all of the committees of the House, or a great majority of them, enjoy jurisdiction over subjects of as great permanent importance, or of as lively present public interest, as the questions now being widely discussed and agitated all over the country relating to the nation-wide enfranchisement of women.

We do not desire, however, to base our petition and request for the appointment of a Committee on Woman Suffrage solely on the proposition that the subject is one of greater importance than those included within the jurisdiction of many committees of the House. A mere reading of the list of House committees makes it clear that for reasons best known to itself the House has seen fit to constitute a number of committees having comparatively narrow or relatively unimportant jurisdiction. We do not plead for this committee on the ground that the House has other committees less important in jurisdiction, but rather on the ground—and this I desire to emphasize—that the House of Representatives has never, so far as my recollection and information go, failed to provide by general or special committee for the study and consideration of any vitally important question that has arisen in the growth, development, and evolution of the Nation.

Years ago the House provided for a Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, a subject of vital interest to all our people, and yet the jurisdiction of the Nation over the alcoholic liquor traffic, outside of the question of internal revenue, which still remains with the Committee on Ways and Means, compared with the combined jurisdiction of the States, is very limited. It is not long since that the House took from the Committee on Public Lands jurisdiction over the question of irrigation of certain lands, an important and highly useful jurisdiction, and yet in a certain sense quite limited and local. At the beginning of this Congress the House in its wisdom established a Committee on Roads, a subject of nation-wide interest, but only peculiarly so at this time because the country, having awakened to a realization of the value of good roads, the people have demanded that Congress give the subject more detailed and definite attention separate and apart from collateral questions.

I do not refer to these particular committees by way of comparison, but because their information emphasizes and illustrates, each in peculiar manner, the practice of the House in meeting changing conditions and increasing public interest in the subjects over which these committees were given jurisdiction.

It will no doubt be urged that the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress are fully competent and have sufficient time to consider the question of woman suffrage. A similar argument could have been made with equal force against the creation of the committees to which I have specifically referred, as well as against the establishment of a score of committees which the House has seen fit from time to time to create.

The question of woman suffrage is the most important question affecting the suffrage that has been before the people of the country since the foundation of the Government; and that is equally true whether you view the question of granting the franchise to women favorably or unfavorably. Our petition to you, gentlemen, is supported by the fact that the House of Representatives has never failed to make provision for the consideration, by a committee of its members selected with special regard for their knowledge and information on the subject, of any matter of as great fundamental importance and as wide and lively public interest as this question.

To realize, gentlemen, that the creation of such a committee as we ask will not necessarily and of itself result in action in harmony with the views we held, we do not ask or expect a committee constituted to represent our views; we ask for a committee whose special duty it should be to consider the question and before whom all shades of opinion on the subject may be presented. If we fail to convince such a committee representing the House of the wisdom of legislation or of presenting a constitutional amendment for woman suffrage we must assume, as all good citizens should, that the committee had excellent reasons for differing with us, but in asking for the opportunity to appear before a committee especially charged with the duty of considering this important question we feel that we are only asking the House of Representatives—the only body in this country directly representing all of the people—to follow its usual rule and procedure.

STATEMENT OF MRS. OSCAR HUNDLY, OF ALABAMA.

Mrs. HUNDLY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this committee, as another southern woman, an Alabamian, I wish to say that any statement that all of the men or all of the women of Alabama are opposed to the infusion of our first aid by our direct influence in the Government in which we live is no more true than it is true of any true southern chivalry, or the chivalry of Alabama, when that application of "crank," "old maid," "faddist," "unhappily married women" is made by allusion seriously to us, when we, perchance, happen to differ upon a matter of great importance in this Government in which we live. We, perhaps, are cranks, and we plead guilty to the charge, when the life and the opportunities of the little children in our State is involved; when our aid is invoked in removing the children 5 years of age, working 10 and 11 hours a day on our Gulf coast, in Alabama; when their right is involved, then I say we mothers, and we potential mothers, are cranks.

The Alabama gentleman in Congress, who spoke here this morning, when he dwelt upon the habits of the hornbeak bird, the male mosquito, and the sun and the moon in turn, has withheld from the Alabama men and women the opportunity to have this great question presented, as he so wonderfully used it—for I challenged him to joint debate on a discussion of these great issues, to be governed by the usual rules of debate, knowing that the gentlemen who are in our political life in our State, who are now in their senatorial campaign, could not take up this question, it not being a political issue in our State campaign, and desiring honestly that the men and the women of the State should have the question put squarely and fairly before them, I challenged this gentleman to honorable discussion of these great issues on their merits, but he did not see fit to give us in Alabama the opportunity of hearing him upon these questions.

Of course, these remarks of mine, I realize, are just as pertinent when considered in connection with the establishment of a committee before the House as were the aforesaid reference to the male mosquito, the hornbeak bird, and the sun and the moon, but what is pertinent and what you gentlemen, we hope, will consider in connection with our request for the establishment of this committee, is the fact that we have in all parts of the country—North, East, South, and West—men who still believe with the immortal Lincoln, whom the gentleman from Alabama so beautifully misquoted this morning, when that immortal man said: "I go for all sharing the privileges of government who assist in bearing its burdens."

And we women assist in bearing the burdens, and are happy in doing it. We ask only for the chance to have our rights passed upon by the usual course prescribed by our Government when our rights are at stake.

Mrs. McCULLOCH. Our next speaker comes from Utah. References have been made to the Utah people, and she has been asked to represent them. She is Mrs. Louise Shepherd, president of the Women's Christian Temperance Association.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. LOUISE SHEPHERD, OF SALT LAKE CITY,
UTAH.**

Mrs. SHEPHERD. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I feel that I must explain that I am not in mourning. I am here to represent the other side, and I always resent anything said against Utah, because it does not take into consideration the large number of women there. I am from Tennessee, a southern woman, and I am proud of it, and I am also mighty glad I live in Utah now. I suppose I am the oldest woman voter in the house, because I have been voting 17 years exactly. I am proud to say I enjoy my citizenship, because I feel I have a divine right as a thinking human being, not as a female, but as a thinking human being to say what law shall be made to influence my child, my home, my State, and my Nation. I used to be an antisuffragist; I used to sit back with these other people, but I heard Susan B. Anthony, and when I heard her I got converted. When my old, aristocratic southern mother came out from North Carolina she was never going to vote, but when Bill Bryan ran I wish you gentlemen could have seen my mother get to the polls to vote. That is the way these southern women are, you know, when they get a chance.

I think I should like to quote the Bible to the gentleman from Alabama this evening. I teach a Sunday school class, and I know my Bible, and I tell you he had better go back and read Genesis, where it says: "In the beginning God created male and female"—when you get to that point you men never finish—"and he gave them dominion over the earth." There is not one word about "he" gave them dominion over the earth. And that is the reason I believe we have the right to vote.

I want this committee appointed, and to have that committee come to Utah, come to Salt Lake City where I live. I will show you there the finest men in the world, who believe in this thing; and I will show you the best laws in the United States. We do not say much about Utah because we have got a kind of hard name, nevertheless we have passed some of the best laws on earth, and the past year we have put many of them through. We Utah women stand together.

I do not know the party politics of half a dozen women in our town. We stand for principles, not for party. Women always stand together for principle and not for party. We put through a working hour for women; we put through the minimum-wage law for women; we put through the mothers' pension law; we put through nine liquor laws.

This is not my first time to plead before a committee, and I want to tell you that when we go there and when we say that we hold 80,000 votes of women who demand this bill or that bill, we always get it every time. This is just to show what Utah is doing so you will not think so badly of Utah hereafter.

STATEMENT OF MRS. SAKÉ D. MEEHAN, OF NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, at this late moment I have just a few words to say to you. If you have any lingering idea, which I doubt, that the southern woman is behind the rest

of the women of the United States—I am here to speak for a large number of the women of Louisiana who want to vote; who know they want to vote, and who know why they want to vote. We know our needs in Louisiana. We need better schools, better homes, better streets, and better sanitary regulations. We need all sorts of constructive things. And just incidentally, speaking of sanitation, was it not the votes of 150,000 women in New Orleans who voted for the bond issue which enabled New Orleans to have its first system of sewerage and drainage, and, I presume, also made possible other sanitary measures that have been taken at different times, including the fight on the malarial mosquito. I think that indicates to you that the women of New Orleans, 15,000 of them at least, do want to vote and have voted and will vote—vote taxes on themselves at any time for the benefit of their municipality.

I represent the woman's suffrage party of Louisiana, which is working along broad educational lines, and when we go out in the State to talk we talk good citizenship and constructive legislation along all lines, the development of our resources, the conservation of our youth. We need better living conditions and we knew that the present conditions can only be altered for the better through the channels of government. And we know that we can only affect government practically and directly by means of the ballot. We hope that you will give us our committee in the House, looking toward congressional action to the end that we may obtain nationwide woman's suffrage.

STATEMENT OF MRS. IDA PORTER-BOYER, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

In being introduced as a Pennsylvanian, may I beg to remind the committee that it is eminently fitting that a woman from Pennsylvania should ask the appointment of a committee on woman suffrage. Pennsylvania proudly recalls the fact that for two years she was governed ably and wisely by Hannah Penn, and to dower the women of my State with the ballot would be a natural and just continuance of the counsel of women in public affairs.

The psychology of the ballot in its relation to motherhood is the one point which I desire to emphasize. What is the subtle effect of disfranchised motherhood on the sons we rear? During the early years of boyhood our sons rely on our judgment, born of experience. And "mother's opinion" is a determining factor in the conduct of the boy. When later the study of civil government reveals to the son that in the administration of the State "mother's opinion" is not counted, what is the effect on the immature judgment of the boy? Do you wonder that mothers sometimes find their hold relaxed and the boy is no longer susceptible to her influence? Motherhood with power is the truest expression of dignity, and the nation, where parenthood is administered in justice, means equality in service, in opportunity and progress.

Mrs. McCULLOCH. Somebody asked to have Mrs. Hepburn speak.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HEPBURN, OF CONNECTICUT.

Mrs. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, do I understand these gentlemen here are members of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. There are 11 members altogether. This is about an average attendance.

Mrs. HEPBURN. Then if we convert all of you gentlemen, every one of you, the rest of the committee could outvote you?

Mr. LENROOT. Provided they were unconverted.

Mrs. HEPBURN. Then you will have to work very hard for us, will you not? We are really asking a great deal of you gentlemen, because at the present time you really have the Government in your own hands, you men, and it is just as if the working people would come to the capitalists and ask some concessions, so we realize we are really attacking the ones in power. We have no political power, and we are asking you to concede a little of it to us. You will have to be in a very, very sympathetic frame of mind, and you will have to be very, very just before you will be willing to do that.

One of the ladies this afternoon said that the reason why women want to vote is because we want to protect our girls from men. I can not feel that really is the reason we want the vote at all. I have three little boys myself, and I feel that we want the vote just as much to protect our boys as we do to protect our girls, and that we women would be much worse off, perhaps, without you men than you men would be without us, because the men, after all, have developed most of the material resources of the country—the railroads, the telephones, and the telegraph—and sometimes I feel that you men almost have the right to feel as if you did it all and as if we women had just been sitting back and had been the cooks and the handmaids, and all that. Yet you all realize that we have accomplished something, even though we have done nothing else than the domestic work; that we have in some measure contributed to the whole. Also, I think you will agree with me that we have contributed something in the human point of view, in regard to the relationship between men and women.

Even the gentleman from Alabama this morning, who gave us such a flowery story about womanhood, and you know we are always suspicious of men who talk like that. The only man at one of our hearings who gave us a speech such as did the gentleman from Alabama was a man of very questionable character. I am not making any allusions to the gentleman from Alabama, but this man to whom I refer, who talked to us, told the most shady and disgraceful and unspeakable stories afterwards. That is the kind of man who really want the women home, because when he acts like himself he is not fit company for women.

If men and women were going to be in the world together he would have to be quite a different man from what he is. I tell you, gentlemen, we are not working for the vote because we want to protect our girls, but we are working for the vote because we know and think you will—when you stop to think about your boyhood, the way your mothers brought you up—you will realize that if the mothers are going to train their boys to the things which women care for, a pure life, and all that sort of thing; if women are going to have any chance at all to have their point of view carried through, they have got to have some power in the outside world. What chance do we have now, I honestly ask you, in bringing up our children? What chance have we got if we do not know what is happening in the outside world and we do not have any control? Now we either have the responsibility for the bringing up of our children or we have not; and if we have it, then is it not necessary that we should have some voice

in the framing of the laws. The reason we feel so strongly about this is because we do not want to send our children out into a world where the woman's point of view does not obtain, any more than you men want to send your children into the world where the man's point of view does not obtain. Here are you four men here this afternoon. You have a chance to take a definite step toward the freedom of women, and now the question before you is this. I think it is a perfect shame to have bothered you and bored you and talked at you all day long, but I do ask you to stop and think, in making up your decision think simply this: Shall we take one definite step in the appointment of a committee toward the thing we know is bound to come?

Mrs. McCULLOCH. Mrs. Harper, of New York City, will present one of her points, and then we will call on Mr. Mondell.

STATEMENT OF MRS. IDA HUSTED HARPER, OF NEW YORK CITY.

Mrs. HARPER. I intended to speak from some of the notes I have been taking of this antisuffrage hearing, and they cover all the points which I think have been made, but I never felt so sorry for a committee in my life, therefore I will only take up one point. Before I do I simply want to say that when Miss Blackwell was telling you we did not stand for militancy, she forgot to say that the only threat of militancy we have heard in these whole three days of discussion was that made by Mr. Wheeler, that when women struck at men he wanted us to understand that the men knew how to strike back. That is the only note of militancy you heard, and that was made by an antisuffragist.

The only point I will ask you to let me speak about for a minute now is this one, that no class that ever have been enfranchised in this country have been required to prove what they would do with their votes when they got them. It has never been discussed with any other class whether their enfranchisement would prove a benefit to the Government or whether it would prove a disadvantage to it. The three classes which have been brought into the electorate since the beginning of our Government are, first, the workingmen, who, when they were enfranchised in the twenties, were not educated as now. The other class was the slaves, immediately after the war. When they were enfranchised there was never a question as to whether they would improve the electorate or hurt it. The third class, the American Indians, and, as I understand it, when they were brought in Congress simply said that all Indians who will sever their tribal relationship and take up land in severalty shall become citizens of the Government, and as such entitled to vote under the laws of the State where they live. Those are the three classes that have been enfranchised and there has been no question as to whether they would improve things or hurt things; and now, in the President's message, he asks you to bring in the Porto Rican men, and I have no doubt that Congress will do that. Are you going to bring in those Porto Rican men because you think they are needed in the electorate and because they will make conditions better, and all that? You see, we women are the one class who have ever asked for suffrage in this country to whom all these objections have been made and in regard

to whom all these fears have been expressed. There is not a class of voters in the United States to-day which has lifted one finger to get the ballot, yet the women of this country have been struggling 65 years for a right to a voice in the Government, and all these objections are made to them, and you must admit that they are the best-equipped class of voters that have ever asked to come into the electorate, and yet you have kept them out for 65 years. All we ask of you is to help us in our struggle a little; to make it a little less hard than it has been by giving us a committee that we can bring our cause before and get some consideration from.

Mrs. McCULLOCH. Before we hear Mr. Mondell, who is going to close this hearing, I want to thank you very much for your attention and put in first this little statement which Mrs. Upton did not read, also these documents which Miss Blackwell did not have time to read, and the reports of an investigation among the mayors of 140 cities. I personally wrote letters to those 140 mayors and asked them 10 questions, and I have their answers in synopsis in a little pamphlet, which I will put before the committee. And while I feel that the proceedings of this afternoon have been very interesting, and that what our sisters have done all this morning and yesterday has been interesting, still no doubt some of you are weary, even as my little son was at the reading of the Bible. When his father was reading at prayers little Frank turned and said "Amen"; and at first his father did not reply to him; and the second time little Frank said "Amen." Then his father said, "Well, Frankie, did you get your pint cup full?" Little Frankie turned around and said to his father, "I have had 3 quarts already." And I fear that you gentlemen will feel that you have had 3 quarts already. Unless there are some questions you gentlemen wish to ask of us, we will hear from Mr. Mondell.

Mr. POT. There are no questions. I wish to say, of course, to both sides that you will have the liberty to include any briefs that you may wish, and the committee will take it all up and consider the matter.

Mrs. McCULLOCH. We will now have the strong masculine voice.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK W. MONDELL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING.

Mr. MONDELL. Gentlemen of the Committee on Rules, I did not expect to participate in this hearing. I had no idea of doing so until invited within the last few moments. I am somewhat handicapped in making a closing statement, the fact that I have not had the opportunity of hearing any of the arguments or discussion, with the exception of one speech. I had the privilege and the pleasure of listening to the exceedingly strong and forceful argument in favor of woman suffrage made this morning by the gentleman from Alabama, or was it intended for an argument against woman suffrage? I think, taking it as a whole, that it was the most conclusive argument I have ever heard in favor of woman suffrage. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that it is entirely the proper thing to take the time of this committee arguing the question of the wisdom of woman suffrage or the propriety of granting the franchise to women. As a colleague of yours, I realize that your duty is to determine

whether or no the question as to whether half of the citizenship of the United States is to be given an opportunity to participate in government is a question of sufficient importance to justify the appointment of a committee in the House of Representatives for its consideration, there being no committee now in the House directly charged with the duty of investigating or passing upon all of the many questions that are involved in that proposition.

We have in the House in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, Ways and Means, Rivers and Harbors, Public Lands, and committees of like importance three different and distinct committees whose business it is to investigate and pass upon questions relating to the election of Members of the House. We have a committee having no other duty or jurisdiction than that of considering the questions involved in the election of the President and Vice President. We have a number of committees that are charged with no duty or responsibility other than that of checking up the expenditures of the several Government departments; we have a committee that has nothing to do but to investigate the question of Members' mileage, and, unfortunately, they do not seem to be investigating it this year. We have a committee that has no other duty than to pass upon the question relating to printing, and we have one committee whose exalted jurisdiction relates to the question of what shall be done with waste paper. In the face of this situation I am surprised to learn there are some people whose minds are so out of joint that they do not consider this, the greatest question now before the American people, of sufficient importance to justify the House of Representatives in establishing a committee for its consideration.

I realize that the question as to whether you gentlemen believe in woman suffrage or not is not one that should enter into your consideration of the matter or affect your decision. Your duty is to pass upon the question as to its real importance, as to its relative importance compared with other matters over which committees have jurisdiction.

How important must a question be before it becomes of such commanding measure that the House of Representatives should have a special committee for its consideration? I have called attention to the fact that it is our practice, and always has been, to appoint a committee for the consideration of any question of any considerable importance, and we have appointed committees for the consideration of questions of but trifling and insignificant importance. If there is anyone who does not think that the question as to whether or no the more intelligent and the better half of mankind shall participate in Government is an important question, my sympathy goes out to them. There is no question now before the people of greater importance. We have a committee whose business it is to inquire as to how much further we should extend the franchise to the little brown brother over in the Philippines, some six or seven millions of him, and the President considers that a sufficiently important matter to refer to it in his message. I hope that it was through forgetfulness and not deliberate intent that the President seemed to fail to realize that the granting the franchise to the little brown brother in the Philippines is of vastly less importance than the question of granting the franchise to the wives and sisters among the 95,000,000 of the folks here at home.

I was very much touched with that little story told by the gentleman from Alabama about the hornbill bird. The hornbill, he told us, has so little faith and confidence in his female kind that he proceeds to wattle her up in a mud nest, and we have the authority of the gentleman from Alabama to the fact that it is the duty of the male bird to feed cherries to his thus imprisoned mate. What if some of the cherries happened to be brandied and the male lingered by the way and did not appear at the appropriate time, what happens to the lady hornbill on the nest? The trouble is that in this world of ours sometimes the male hornbill of mankind does find a brandied cherry, and he does not get back to the nest in time, and we want to take the lady out of this medieval mud nest in which some people would like to keep her and give her a fair opportunity in the world.

Then there was that beautiful moonshine illustration, as poetic and as lovely as any of the many poetic effusions of my eloquent friend from Alabama. The only trouble about that illustration was that it carried with it the old notion that womankind must shine entirely by the reflected light of the puffed-up lords of creation.

There was a time when women demanded the ballot as a right, and they were told that the elective franchise was not a right, but a privilege; and of course that ended the argument from that standpoint. It was not a right, but it was a privilege; therefore, why talk about women's rights? Then when it was suggested that the better half of mankind should not be denied any privilege she sought, the gentlemen again shifted their ground and said that it was not a privilege, but a burden; and chivalric gentlemen, like the gentleman from Alabama, do not want to lay this awful burden on the shoulders of lovely women.

There have been some things said here in regard to the effect of woman suffrage. I live in a State where women have been voting for 43 years at all elections and for all offices. I am perhaps as intimately acquainted with that State and its conditions as any man, for not only did I know it well 20 years ago as a prospector, as a railroad builder, as a miner, as a farmer and stockman, but I have come to know it better in 10 congressional campaigns, in which I have traversed the entire State. Gentlemen of the committee, an ounce of fact is worth one ton of pure assumption or presumption. The gentleman from Alabama does not want households disrupted; he does not want wives and husbands brought into a condition of irritation and conflict.

If the testimony of one who speaks from experience is worth while, I can say with full realization that it is a sweeping statement; in 27 years' knowledge of a people where woman suffrage prevails—as wide and complete knowledge as any man has—I have never known a single solitary case where a difference of political opinion resulted in family quarrels, jars, or misunderstanding; not a single one. That is saying a good deal, but I say it with emphasis, because it is a remarkable fact. When men and women begin to exercise the elective franchise together and realize their joint and personal responsibility in the discharge of their political duties, the question as to how any member of the family votes comes to be considered one that the individual should be allowed to decide without interference or coercion; at least, that is the way it works in Wyoming. Are we to understand that men elsewhere—in Alabama, for instance—are

less considerate than with us, and that they would raise a row if their women folks did not vote as they wanted them to? Is that the expected source of the family troubles which our Alabama friend fears under suffrage? Of course, if there are men anywhere so overbearing and inconsiderate that they would make trouble if the women of their families failed to vote as they ordered, there would, no doubt, be some trouble. I refuse to believe men are so domineering or inconsiderate anywhere.

Of course, after people have lived together for years, if they have lived together harmoniously they come to agree very largely in politics and in religion, and the question what member of the family most largely or generally influences in politics, like the question of whose church eventually becomes the family church, depends largely upon the subject whose faith is best grounded and most enduring.

The exercise of the franchise is a right; it is also a privilege, but above that and beyond the question of right or privilege, and more important, stands the fact that, as time goes on and we are attempting to wisely meet the multitude of questions that arise in government, many of them social and economic, we need the help, the aid, and assistance of the best half of mankind.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned.)

O





WILLIS DINDERY

MAR 1984

WALTON, MA 02154

